

THE JEFFERSONIAN COURTHOUSE
NHL THEMATIC NOMINATION PROJECT

Draft

By

Charles Brownell, Ph. D.

With the Assistance of

Erika S. A. Moore and Craig A. Reynolds

Virginia Commonwealth University

Richmond, Virginia

June-September 2003

OUTLINE

I. Introduction

X. Format. [Explanations go here]

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

- A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787)
- B. Jefferson and the Orders
- C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
- D. Jefferson and Models
- E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
- F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
- G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
- H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
- I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)
- J.

Appendix 1 Thomas Jefferson's Specifications for a Model Courthouse

I. Introduction

"But how is a taste in this beautiful art to be formed in our countrymen, unless we avail ourselves of every occasion when public buildings are to be erected, of presenting . . . models for . . . study and imitation?"

Thomas Jefferson on the Virginia State Capitol to James Madison, 20 September
1785;

Thomas Jefferson on the Virginia State Capitol to Edmund Randolph, 20 September
1785.¹

[INTRODUCTION MUST SUM UP EVERY MAJOR IDEA IN THIS STUDY IN ONE
PARAGRAPH AS CONCISELY AS HUMANLY POSSIBLE]

I. Introduction

¹For Jefferson to Madison and Randolph, see *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Julian P. Boyd et al., 25 vols. to date (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950-), 8:534-39. I have quoted the phrasing in the Madison letter (p. 535) rather than the variant in the Randolph letter (p. 538). THE FOLLOWING IS NOT CHANGED FROM USCAP N. For the period after May, 1793, the last date currently covered by the Papers, I have relied on four microform editions of the Jefferson documents (all four of which are available at the Virginia Historical Society): Jefferson, Papers, 1606-1889, 65 reels, microfilm (positive) made from the originals in the Thomas Jefferson Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., 1974; Papers, 1705-1827, 16 reels, microfilm (positive) made from the originals in the Thomas Jefferson Coolidge collection of manuscripts at the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, 1977; Papers, 1732-1828, 10 reels, microfilm (positive) made under the auspices of the University of Virginia Library, the National Historical Publications Commission, and the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation from originals and copies at the University of Virginia Library, 1977; and Papers, 1761-1826, 4 reels, microfilm (positive) made from the originals in the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, San Marino, California, 1991. Hereafter I shall cite Jefferson documents from these four sources by identifying the repository and the microfilm reel number. For helpful guides to the twelve major public collections of Jefferson documents, see Douglas W. Tanner et al., eds., *Guide to the Microfilm Edition of the Jefferson Papers of the University of Virginia, 1732-1828*, Microfilm Publications No. 9 (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Library, 1977), pp. 17-20, and the typescript guide to the Massachusetts Historical Society microfilm edition, pp. 23-25. Jefferson's outgoing letters often exist as an original and an essentially identical duplicate produced by one or another technique.

Summary.

Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) is the first American architect of international stature. This great representative of the Renaissance tradition of the amateur designer taught himself how to create buildings because he had no other way of getting access to the art of architecture in the hinterlands of Virginia. Jefferson wrote about his values, stressing two: durable brick and stone rather than wood for construction, and the Classical Orders of column for ornament. At an early point he set out to reform the architecture around him in his native Virginia, and later he extended his attempt to his young nation. To spread his reform he relied on a powerful custom that later Americans have forgotten: in Jefferson's time it was an old and widespread custom for new buildings to imitate standing buildings, often as a matter of contract. As interesting as Jefferson's domestic designs are, he owes his international status to his public buildings. Within this field he achieved his greatest results at the United States Capitol and the White House in Washington, but here his influence became obscured in mingling with the preferences of other men. Jefferson's University of Virginia is his masterpiece, but it remains a unique marvel. The impact of Jefferson as a designer on American civic architecture work rested on how he put traditional room-plans inside temple-shaped bodies. He did this first at the Virginia State Capitol, a building flawed externally by crude execution and defective stucco and not closely imitated. Far more successfully, Jefferson united established courtroom planning and the temple body in a modest, Tuscan conception with red-brick walls and stucco only on the columns, a pattern that reshaped Virginia courthouses for a generation. The spread of this pattern was partly a by-product of the University of Virginia buildings, where Jefferson set models for construction and the Orders, trained craftsmen, and absorbed inspiration from the second American architect of international stature, B. Henry Latrobe, the great professional, whose influence decisively shaped

the courthouse reform. That reform was imperfect – for instance, Jefferson’s circulation patterns were flawed, he never figured out how to integrate a bell with a temple, and his ideals for the Orders were compromised by the Adamesque fashion. Jefferson nonetheless gave Virginia a body of noble courthouse buildings fully worthy of the highest ideals of the law that is administered within them.

Method.

In 2002, of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources approached the author to undertake the present study with his graduate students because of his publications on Jefferson and his long interest in Jeffersonian courthouses. In 2002 staff members of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources provided a list of fifteen Jeffersonian courthouses drawn from the standard study, John O. Peters and Margaret T. Peters, Virginia's Historic Courthouses (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), winner of Association for State and Local History.

X. Method [?] and Format. [Explanation goes here?]

Sources

This project was undertaken collaboratively with Virginia Commonwealth University graduate students in the 2003 seminar “The Architectural World of Jefferson and Latrobe.” Copies of the students’ reports, cited below, are available in Special Collections and Archives, James Branch Cabell Library, Virginia Commonwealth University.

The present study also cites research by my University of Virginia graduate students in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Copies of their reports are

available in the Fiske Kimball Fine Arts Library, the University of Virginia [am I sure?].

Acknowledgments. Ann C. de Witt, Graphics Coordinator, Virginia Historical Society

Notations – Temporary

Outlines, Chap 1. I am repeating outline at head of each section only while working on the draft, in order to keep the organization clear in my head.

P means that a quoted passage has been proofread.

EVERY PARA BEGINS WITH THE TOPIC SENTENCE.

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

[THE FOLLOWING, ALREADY EDITED FROM INTRO SUMMARY IN MVA SURVEY NO. 7, SHOULD BE ADAPTABLE TO SUIT PURPOSE. CHANGE IT BUT KEEP IT SHORT.]

It seems probable that, like his Italian Renaissance hero Andrea Palladio and Palladio's British followers, Jefferson thought that he was practicing the one, true architecture that the Greeks and Romans – the “Ancients” -- had founded on the unchanging Laws of Nature (fig. 1 TEMPLE JUP). It also seems probable that, like many of his contemporaries, Jefferson believed that the “Moderns,” the architects from the renewal of antiquity in the Renaissance onward, had not equaled the Ancients' achievements . (Fig. 2 PALL'S VILLA ROTA).. [Except in case of Palladio's Orders. (Fig. 3 PALL'S ORDERS). Propose TJ's hierarchy of Ancient/Modern re statehouse (Fig. 4 VA CAP PHOTO) , magistrate's house (Fig. 5, PRES HOUSE, fig. 6, MAGISTRATE'S HOUSE), private house. Spell out that TJ used corrupt Leoni Palladio. State as a principle that a reference to Palladio's Orders here normally means as modified by Leoni unbeknownst to TJ]²

²For a discussion of Jefferson in relation to the “Antients” and the “Moderns,” see Brownell in Making of Virginia Architecture, xx-xx.

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

- A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787)
- B. Jefferson and the Orders
- C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
- D. Jefferson and Models
- E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
- F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
- G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
- H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
- I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

- II. A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787) QUOTS NOT PROOFED

It is fairly common knowledge that Thomas Jefferson wished to reform the architecture of the Old Dominion. It is uncommon knowledge that Jefferson spelled out exactly what he found wrong with Virginia's buildings in his only book, the Notes on the State of Virginia. As the present section will show in detail, Jefferson concerned himself chiefly with only two charges: Virginians did not adorn public buildings with the Orders, and they did not construct private buildings from enduring materials. Among people who do not read what Jefferson wrote, a nonsense-legendry has grown up to the effect that, as a reformer, Jefferson wished to return to the origins of architecture, to revive the architecture of Republican Rome for the new American republic, to apply the innovations of the French architectural avant-garde of the late eighteenth century in his own nation, to create an American style, or to do all of the preceding in one mighty swoop. All of these supposed goals are the fantasies concocted during the second half of the twentieth century. Rather, in the Notes Jefferson identified his leading goals, to promote the use of the Orders and – the topic on which he laid special emphasis – to promote construction of

brick and stone rather than more perishable wood. If we review what he wrote in the Notes, we shall see that his loyalty to the Orders belonged to a larger devotion to [regular architecture?], and that he mentioned an enduring aesthetic of his, a love of the “light and airy.” But we shall be brought back again and again to the two major issues of the Orders and masonry construction, which are definitive for understanding the Jeffersonian courthouse.³

In the Notes Jefferson’s discussion of Virginia architecture seems disorderly but it does fall roughly into three sections: private buildings, public buildings, and private buildings once more. Jefferson opened by stating the masonry theme: “the private buildings are very rarely constructed of stone or brick; much the greatest proportion being of scantling [small pieces of lumber] and boards.” His next sentence – “It is impossible to devise things more ugly, uncomfortable, and happily more perishable” – looks more widely and may invoke Vitruvius’ celebrated tripod of architectural values, attractiveness, utility, and soundness. Jefferson then commented neutrally that “two or three plans” governed “most of the houses” before he reverted to perishable construction of logs or frame (more expensive than logs but less effective at temperature control).⁴

Jefferson next veered off into diet before turning to his second major topic, public buildings. Now he considered four Williamsburg structures, “the only public buildings worthy mention.” He began with the second Williamsburg Capitol (1751-53; Fig. 7), “the most

³Identify authoritative ed. of Notes as Peden. I am proud to acknowledge a great teacher, Frank H. Sommer III, the former Head of Library at the H. F. du Pont Winterthur Museum. My debt to Sommer will be evident to anyone who reads Sommer’s study “Thomas Jefferson’s First Plan for a Virginia Building,” in Papers on American Art, edited by John C. Milley, 87-112 (Maple Shade, New Jersey: Edinburgh Press, for the Friends of Independence National Historical Park, 1976).

⁴For the tripos of venustas, utilitas, and firmitas see Vitruvius 1.3.2. The translation of the terms above comes from Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture, translated by Ingrid D. Rowland, with commentary and illustrations by Thomas Noble Howe, and additional commentary by Ingrid D. Rowland and Michael J. Dewar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 26. The possible connection between the tripos and Jefferson’s “ugly, uncomfortable, and ... perishable” Cote [diss. IS THIS 1ST

pleasing piece of architecture we have,” which Jefferson called “light and airy,” a phrase that probably referred only to the two-tiered Palladian portico. Apropos of the Capitol Jefferson evaluated nothing but the Orders. That is, he did not even mention the plan, even though, in 1785, well before he made the revisions for the definitive text of the Notes (1787), he had copied that very plan for his Richmond Capitol. Rather, Jefferson critiqued the Orders of the Williamsburg Capitol portico in detail. The gist of his remarks was that the lower, Doric Order was “tolerably just in its proportions and ornaments,” whereas the upper, Ionic Order was highly disproportionate with detailing “not proper to the order.” No doubt Jefferson had already set about correcting this portico with the pair that he devised as part of his museum of the Orders at the first Monticello (fig. 8 MONTI MODEL).⁵

Jefferson’s second example was the Governor’s Palace (fig. 9 BODL PL., lower right). Jefferson found this Late Stuart building “not handsome” externally but commodious, well sited, and “capable of being made an elegant seat.” We know what it would have taken to make the building “elegant” in Jefferson’s eyes because we have his design for transforming the Palace with a stunning display of the Orders. Jefferson’s project (fig. 10, NICHOLS) proposed turning the structure into a powerful temple-form edifice with a mighty and deep octastyle portico in front, a grand but shallower octastyle portico in back, and colonnaded wings at the sides. On the exterior the conception is an ancestor of Jefferson’s consummate reform design, the University of Virginia (fig. 11 BÖYE VIEW). On the interior the drawing shows us Jefferson once again accepting most of a received plan.⁶

REFERENCE?], 5-6.

⁵For the chronology of the composition and editions of the Notes, see Peden’s Introduction, xi-xxi. [NEED CITATION OF WENGER HERE ON USE OF PLAN FOR RICHMOND CAPITOL?]

⁶Jefferson’s design is K98/N425 in the Massachusetts Historical Society. IS THIS FIRST USE OF K AND N NOS.?

Jefferson's third and fourth examples of public buildings were the College of William and Mary (fig. 9, top) and the [PROPER NAME?] Hospital. But for their roofs these "rude, mis-shapen piles" would have passed as brick-kilns, he wrote. That is, they did not have porticoes. Jefferson continued that "there are no other public buildings but churches and courthouses in which no attempts are made at elegance. Indeed it would not be easy to execute such an attempt, as a workman could scarcely be found here capable of drawing an order [emphasis added]." Once again, just as with the Palace, it is clear that elegance in architecture meant the display of the Orders (fig. 3).

Jefferson then observed generally that the guardian spirit of architecture seemed to have shed its curses on Virginia. He lamented the expensive private buildings that lacked "symmetry and taste," often displaying a "burthen of barbarous ornaments," that is, ornaments very different from properly used Orders. Jefferson stated that "the first principles of the art are unknown" – one must remember that ??? the Orders dominate the discussion of first principles in Palladio's Book I – "and there exists scarcely a model among us sufficiently chaste to give an idea of them." Jefferson voiced the hope that the revised curriculum at William and Mary would produce the necessary reformers.

Now Jefferson opened the third major section of his discussion of Virginia architecture. He squared off against the overwhelmingly dominant structural tradition among Virginians, who from their first settlement onward had built all but exceptional structures with wood – with post construction, log construction, and frame. In Jefferson's concluding discussion, he launched into an extended attempt to counter a prejudice against masonry houses because of condensation problems. In fact, this concluding section promoting the erection of masonry dwellings amounts to more than half of Jefferson's discussion of Virginia architecture. The section closed with

Jefferson's well-known argument that, "when buildings are of durable materials, every new edifice is an actual and permanent acquisition to the state, adding to its value as well as to its ornament."

Jefferson's discussion is winding, it is only approximately divisible into three parts, and a number of values emerge in no clear order. Nonetheless, two themes surface over and over to dominate the text: Virginians should adorn their public edifices with the Orders, and they should build their private houses of more lasting materials than wood. Reviewing Jefferson's remarks prepares us for his reform of courthouses, a program based on instating the Orders, on refining the durable construction that Virginians had used for many public buildings, and – the topic that Jefferson slighted in writing -- on accepting established room layouts. Jefferson's own text even points to the three principal techniques on which he meant to rely in his campaign: to set "a model . . . sufficiently chaste," to train workmen so that they were "capable of drawing an order" (and of executing fine masonry), and to educate a class of leaders in architecture. WHERE PUT THAT EDUCATING LEADERS WAS TO HAPPEN AT UVA, NOT W&M, AND IT DIDN'T HAPPEN EXCEPT PERHAPS VIA THE MODELS SET ON THE LAWN?

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

- A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787)
- B. Jefferson and the Orders
- C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
- D. Jefferson and Models
- E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
- F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
- G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
- H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
- I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

II. B. Jefferson and the Orders

I have examined carefully all the antient Corinthians in my possession, and observe that Palladio, as usual, has given the finest members of them all in the happiest combination.

Jefferson to Arthur S. Brockenbrough, 22 April 1823⁷

[Explain what the Orders are. Explain period use of term ornaments to mean Orders.

FILL THIS IN SUCCINCTLY WHEN CAN.]

In the passage quoted at the head of this section, Jefferson gave the key to his lifelong [? mature?] practice: at least in the matter of the Orders, the great "Modern," Palladio had surpassed the "Antients" (fig. 3). Palladio had selected the best elements ("the finest members") of the ancient Orders, and he had composed these elements in the best way ("the happiest combination"). Jefferson was not writing exclusively about Palladio's Corinthian but about Palladio's performance with the Orders "as usual." REMIND: KNEW LEONI VERSION.

⁷PROOF FROM MICROF TJ PAPERS UVA AND CITE MICROFILM; CP. O'Neal, Rotunda, p. 26. Jefferson was defending his original choice of Palladio's Corinthian entablature for the University of Virginia Rotunda..

There is extensive and vivid evidence that the Jefferson-Brockenbrough passage encapsulates Jefferson's mature practice. Three pointed samples will suffice. First, at Monticello II, Jefferson wrapped his house in the Doric of the Leoni Palladio (figs. 12-14 [MVA #12](#); [DETAIL MONTI ENTABL](#); [AND LEONI DORIC](#)) and brought the visitor inside by the sequence of Doric of Palladio (façade, with portico), Ionic of Palladio (Entrance Hall), and Corinthian of Palladio (Parlor). Second, after a lifetime of learning painfully about the uncertainty of large construction projects, Jefferson made the first three pavilions that he built at the University of Virginia examples of the Doric of Palladio (Pavilion VII, fig. 15), the Ionic of Palladio (Pavilion V), and the Corinthian of Palladio (Pavilion III), joined by colonnades that exemplify the Tuscan of Palladio. Third, Jefferson uniformly avoided following the directions of Vitruvius, the great Ancient, concerning Tuscan, Doric, and Ionic column bases, instead preferring the treatments of Palladio, the great Modern. (For instance, in the Doric examples just mentioned, Jefferson provided molded column bases, even though Vitruvius treated the Doric as an Order with no base at all.)⁸

In setting models for the Orders via the Virginia courthouse, Jefferson had only a compromised success. [Catalogue the courthouse Orders. One Doric, one Ionic, and all the rest Tuscan?] It is in proposing a Palladian Tuscan Order for the Virginia courthouse that Jefferson

⁸Visitors to Monticello may be distracted by Jefferson's borrowing of friezes from ancient temples for the Entrance Hall and Parlor Orders, but these borrowings are firmly inserted into the middle of Palladio's profiles for the Ionic and the Corinthian; see Brownell, "Jefferson's Models," 00-000. On Jefferson's simple original conception of a "sixpack" of the Orders for the University of Virginia, see Brownell in [Making of Virginia Architecture](#), 000-000. Jefferson initially envisioned the models as the Modern Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian of Palladio on the west, facing an Ancient Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian on the east. Jefferson called the clockwise arrangement a "circuit" for the architectural lecturer. With the expansion of the University to ten Pavilions and the Rotunda, the simple pattern became lost. As to the Ancient base treatments that Jefferson simply did not use, Vitruvius gave the Tuscan a circular plinth, unknown in Jefferson's work; Vitruvius gave the Doric no base, a treatment that Jefferson accepted only once, at Pavilion X, as one of the extra models that he used as afterthoughts at the University; and Vitruvius gave the Ionic the authentic Ionian base, not the Attic base of Palladio, Jefferson, and most Moderns; see the Perrault translation of Vitruvius, 000-000, 000-000, 000-000.

met with a conspicuous defeat. The Adamesque taste, which revolved around breaking longstanding rules for the Orders and indulging in subjective proportions, was far too strong for Jefferson's purity. [Not one?] of the [how many?] of the courthouses examined for the present study was built with a pure Tuscan alla Palladio. In the vernacular, "skinny Tuscan" overpowered "husky Tuscan." The consequences of the defeat, however, were not as bad as Jefferson might have supposed.⁹

Orthodox Tuscan. The Tuscan Order is the descendant of the Order that the ancient Etruscans adapted for their temples from the Greek Doric Order. The hallmark of Greek architecture is subtlety, a trait lacking in the Tuscan Order, which was robust or crude, depending on one's point of view. Thanks to the sweeping destruction of Etruscan architecture, the principal source of information on the Etruscan temple is a chapter of the book by 1st century B. C. Roman architect Vitruvius. (That is to say, this source stands at a considerable remove from the Etruscans themselves. Moreover, Vitruvius's illustrations did not survive the Middle Ages.) Apropos of the Tuscan Order, Vitruvius named three traits of significance for the present study. First, Vitruvius' base, properly called the Tuscan base, has a single, bold convex molding or torus (fig. 3, far left). Thus the base differs from the standard ancient or Attic base, which has multiple convex, concave, and straight moldings (fig. 3. all other bases). Second, the height of Vitruvius' column is seven times its diameter at the bottom and thus strikingly stouter than any of the other Vitruvian Orders. Third, Vitruvius' cornice projects very far, to a distance equal to just over a quarter of the height of the column.¹⁰

⁹[CHECK ALL CARDS "ORD TUSC"]The apt terms "skinny Tuscan" and "husky Tuscan" emerged from my discussions of this project with my graduate students.

¹⁰For standard studies of the Tuscan see Ackerman and Summerson. For Vitruvius on the Tuscan Order, see his *Libri Decem*, 4.7. For the most recent English version, see Vitruvius, *Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture*, translated by Ingrid D. Rowland, with commentary and illustrations by Thomas Noble Howe,

Vitruvius interested Jefferson more than twentieth-century architectural historians recognized, and from Vitruvius stretches a chain of writers – Palladio, Fréart de Chambray, and Gibbs – who mattered greatly to Jefferson. As to Palladio ID NEEDED HERE?, the scantness of evidence about the Tuscan gave the Renaissance broad leeway in reconstructing the style, and Palladio took advantage of this leeway in his *Quattro Libri dell' Architettura* (1570; figs. 16-18). For each of the other four Orders Palladio gave essentially a single interpretation, but for the parts of the Tuscan he offered half a dozen alternatives, leaving it to his readers to choose. Following Vitruvius, Palladio did offer the hearty Tuscan base among his alternatives (fig. 17), he did specify a column height seven times the diameter (fig. 16), and he did illustrate a widely overhanging cornice (fig. 16). Palladio further illustrated an alternative cornice with a normal projection and a beautiful concave-convex bedmold (fig. 18) – a detail that Palladio loved and repeated for other Orders – curling into a deeply sculpted cyma-curved soffit.

Among Palladio's commentators, it seems to have been the seventeenth-century Classicist Roland Fréart, Sieur de Chambray (1606-1676), who composed the enduring Palladian Tuscan out of the most features in Palladio's plates. In Fréart's *Parallèle* (1650; fig. 19), the French reformer incorporated Palladio's Tuscan base, he accepted the seven-diameter height, and, ignoring Palladio's widely overhanging Vitruvian cornice (fig. 16), Fréart picked Palladio's cornice with the graceful bedmold and the sweeping cyma-curved underside (fig. 18). The eighteenth-century brought a significant change with James Gibbs, the Scot who popularized

and additional commentary by Ingrid D. Rowland and Michael J. Dewar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 4.7, nn. p. 229 (with the caution that Vitruvius was probably describing a Roman adaptation of Tuscan sources), and fig. 73. Jefferson knew Vitruvius only as translated by Claude Perrault; see Vitruvius, *Les dix Livres d'Architecture de Vitruve, corrigez et traduits nouvellement en François, avec des Notes & des Figures*, translated and edited by Claude Perrault, 2nd ed., revised, corrected, and augmented (1684; reprint ed., Brussels: Pierre Mardaga, 1979), 4.7. Cite Palladio 1570 in both reprint and microf? Palladio derives his sculpted soffit at least in part from the Roman [arena at Verona]. Cite Leoni.

many Palladian elements without belonging to the camp of British Palladians proper. In Rules (1732) Gibbs published a simplification of Fréart's Palladian Tuscan. He preserved the Tuscan base, he adhered to a height of seven diameters? But he flattened out the deeply hollowed soffit, probably for economy (fig. 20) [List examples.]

Jefferson began consulting Vitruvius on the Orders near the outset of his career, and at an early date he turned to Gibbs temporarily. It seems fairly certain, however, that for almost the whole of his career Jefferson regarded Palladio as the best interpreter of the Orders, and that from he supplemented Palladio with Fréart. Notably, it is Fréart's rendition of Palladio's Tuscan that Jefferson used for his last word on the Orders, the Lawn of the University of Virginia.¹¹

It is consequential that, in the literary tradition that Jefferson followed, the Tuscan suffered from obloquy.

[What did Palladio write?] And thus Fréart attempted to suppress the Renaissance recreations of the Tuscan altogether, as unnecessary recent concoctions. Such an effort could not succeed: as the least expensive of the Orders, the Tuscan was indispensable, particularly in North America.¹²

Say something about the idea that the Etruscans invented architecture? But this may be irrel. to TJ. MAY WELL BE IRRELEVANT. TJ USED MODERN TUSCAN.

Adamesque Tuscan. [Adam promoted subjective, elongated Orders, and his vogue took off, flowering in the United States long after its extinction in Britain. Following Fréart, Adam

¹¹Cite Palladio 1570 in both reprint and micro? Cite Leoni. Both versions of FdC, 1st and 1766. Gibbs. On Jefferson's view that Palladio had [surpassed the ancients in the Orders?] [see MVA? Otherwise I supposed insert TJ-Brockenbrough 22 April 1823.]

¹²FdC in Evelyn ed. = pp. 2, 4, 8, 87-98. Need to cite 1st ed. and TJ's 1766 ed. Fréart argued that only the three Orders from the Greek world – the Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian – were excellent and necessary, but from his censure of the Orders of the Italian peninsula he excepted Roman honorary columns, such as Trajan's, which he admired and classed as Tuscan.

condemned the Tuscan. It was his follower(s) – who? Pain? Richardson? Asher Benjamin (pl. 21) -- who Adamized the proportions of the Tuscan. The more slender versions had an economic benefit, particularly for building in masonry, where they saved on the cost of material and on the cost of manipulating material into place. It was to Adam that Jefferson referred when he wrote in 17xx that British architecture was the worst that he had ever seen, and it was to the Adamesque that Jefferson referred in 181x when he spoke to Isaac Coles of “[false architecture, so much the vogue at present.]” In the Adamesque, Jeffersonian Palladianism had a powerful opponent. Even Jefferson’s Virginia State Capitol succumbed to a display of attenuated Tuscan in the form of the window and door frames of the main story (fig. 22) that as-yet-unidentified hands instated in place of the surrounds that Jefferson intended.¹³

Every one [?] of the Tuscan courthouses under study has an elongated Order. The results are by no means as disastrous as Jefferson might have thought, however. Some of the courthouses, such as Nansemond (fig. 23 WATSON HEAD-ON) do indeed have a flimsy effect. Others, specifically Charlotte (fig. 24 DHR--HEADON), with columns of diameters, and Goochland (fig. 25 DHR—HEAD-ON), with columns of well over seven diameters, have passed for orthodox until the measurements were checked.

¹³For the migration of elongated Adamesque Orders to North America, see Asher Benjamin, The Country Builder's Assistant: Containing A Collection of New Designs of Carpentry and Architecture (Greenfield, Massachusetts: printed by Thomas Dickman, 1797), pl. 2 and accompanying text; and Asher Benjamin and Daniel Raynerd, The American Builder's Companion: Or, a System of Architecture: Particularly Adapted to the Present Style of Building in the United States of America. (Boston: Etheridge and Bliss, 1806), vi (stating the authors’ goal of lightening the Orders for private building only, at savings of from 1/6 to 1/4), vii, and p. 12-16 with accompanying plates. PREFER TO CHECK THAT I GOT ALL GERMANE PP. Benjamin subsequently converted to the orthodox Roman-inspired Orders of Adam’s competitor Sir William Chambers, and then to the Greek Orders of Adam’s and Chambers’s rivals James Stuart and Nicholas Revett.

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

- A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787)
- B. Jefferson and the Orders
- C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
- D. Jefferson and Models
- E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
- F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
- G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
- H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
- I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

II. C. Jefferson and Durable Construction

When Jefferson criticized the reliance on perishable construction in his Notes, he specifically referred to wooden dwellings. In Virginia, however, with its predominant custom of building in wood, the wooden public building was by no means a thing of the past. Log courthouses, frame courthouses, and, for that matter, [?] flimsily built masonry courthouses were a decided feature of the Virginia landscape. For instance, in 1782 Bedford County built its third courthouse, a log structure, only to replace the building in 1787. By August of 1787, nearby Charlotte County had replaced its second courthouse, a casualty of fire, with a frame facility (fig. 26) that was adorned, not with the Orders, but with a color scheme of red (the roof), white (the walls), and blue (the door and window frames). The practice of raising brick public buildings, though, was firmly rooted in Virginia, as witness the fact that the third Bedford County and the second Charlotte County courthouses gave way to courthouses made of the more enduring material.¹⁴

¹⁴For the examples, see William H. Gaines, Jr., "Courthouses of Bedford and Charlotte Counties," Virginia Cavalcade 21 (Summer 1971):4-13.

What Jefferson did, then, was to enlarge and refine the custom of building brick courthouses. In this endeavor, Jefferson faced two distinct matters: walls and columns. He usually did not pursue other applications of masonry, such as vaulting, nor did he attempt to unseat wood as the material for entablatures and pediments.

Walls. Like masonry construction in general, walls presented Jefferson with two issues, the structure and the surface. [NOW THE HARD PART – WHAT DO I SAY ABOUT BRICK STRUCTURE.. DOES IT DUPLICATE MATTERS TO SAY THAT HE DREW TO HIM THE BEST ARTISANS AND RETRAINED THEM – WILL BRING THIS UP UNDER UVA.]

Apropos of the wall surfaces of brick public buildings, Jefferson underwent a significant evolution from Palladian stucco to exposed brick. The stuccoed façade is sometimes associated too exclusively with the English Regency Period and subsequent nineteenth-century developments. In actuality, the stuccoed brick facade was a venerable Mediterranean tradition and Palladio's structural mainstay, while the stuccoed brick exterior wall was, although not a universal trait in the architecture of Palladio's English-speaking followers, nonetheless a fundamental one. It appears that Jefferson, at the outset of his career in civic architecture, intended a wholesale application of this practice but later converted to the more practical Virginia custom of using unconcealed red brick with lighter trim. Certainly the Virginia State Capitol (fig. 4) was built with a stuccoed brick exterior, and the stucco failed. (In 1811 Latrobe called the Virginia Capitol a "Warning beacon against the projects of Stucco-men.") By contrast, the University of Virginia and the Jeffersonian courthouses have exposed brick walls with trim – trim normally derived from the Orders – of a lighter color, however uncertain the exact nature of the original paint schemes (figs. 000, 000, 000, . . .) This contrast probably had become established in Virginia building practice from around 1700, with the creation of the Later Stuart public buildings of Williamsburg (fig. 9). Jefferson's acceptance of the contrast is a milestone: in doing this, he accepted one of the most recognizable of architectural "Americanisms" into his Palladian reform program of permanent structure and decoration with the Orders.¹⁵

Columns. Like walls, columns presented Jefferson with two constructional issues, one being the material of the shaft and the other being the material of the base and the capital. For

¹⁵[Cite Justin Gunther as reopening the discussion of Jefferson's Palladianism, specifically apropos of stuccoed brick. For Latrobe's opinion of the Virginia Capitol stucco, see his letter to John Wickham, 16 March 1811 (84/E14; 3:42-44). QUOTATION ISN'T PROOFED

the shaft, Jefferson's choice of stuccoed brick was pregnant with significance: this was a structural Palladian-ism that did work in Virginia. One need not question that Palladio was the inspiration, for Jefferson recorded this circumstance. What would prove a long, wearying debate with Latrobe about the Order for the Hall of Representatives at the Capitol in Washington drew from Jefferson a memorable statement on 28 February 1804. On the basis of one his Palladian books, the President wrote the Surveyor of Public Buildings that "most of the buildings erected under Palladio's direction . . . have their columns made of brick . . . and covered over with stucco." Jefferson argued for using stuccoed brick shafts, with stone bases and capitals, in the Hall. Latrobe, who won the day for stone columns for the Hall, led Americans to build major public buildings with finely dressed stone Orders. Jefferson, by contrast, led Virginians to build major public buildings alla Palladio, with column shafts of stuccoed brick (figs. 4, 000. . .). Jefferson himself had probably converted to this course after assessing the problems of using stone shafts – expensive shafts consisting of exceedingly heavy drums that had to consist of workable stone and had to be dressed regularly on all sides -- in a nation with scant practice in sophisticated masonry construction.¹⁶

Bases and capitals presented a challenge in such a country, particularly outside major cities such as Philadelphia, where the building crafts had developed. Deposits of good freestone

¹⁶For Jefferson to Latrobe, 28 February 1804, see [MICROF]; 1:439-40. In the letter Jefferson, who never saw a building by Palladio in the flesh, identified the source of his information on Palladio's stuccoed brick columns as "Ld. Burlington in his notes on Palladio." The statement has occasioned much bewilderment because there is no such book. James Gilreath and Douglas L. Wilson have probably settled the matter in their editorial note to Thomas Jefferson's Library: A Catalog with the Entries in His Own Order, edited by Gilreath and Wilson (Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1989), 14. Gilreath and Wilson conclude that Jefferson meant "Inigo Jones in his notes on Palladio." Jefferson had Jones's notes in Giacomo Leoni's third London edition of The Architecture of A. Palladio (1742); never before published, these notes were a major addition to Palladio's text that Leoni had been trying to make for almost thirty years. Jones's discussion of Palladio's column construction appears on PAGE NO? Gilreath and Wilson point out that Jefferson at least twice confused Jones with Burlington. (One must observe, however, that they do raise a false lead apropos of the Isaac Ware edition of Palladio [London, 1737-ca. 1740]). NEED TO ADD A CITATION TO McLAUGHLIN ON THE SHIFT FROM STONE TO BRICK COLUMNS AT MONTI?

– sedimentary rock that can be cut and chiseled readily – are the exception in Virginia. Stone is heavy and thus was expensive to transport. Like the drums of shafts, bases and capitals had to be regularly dressed for a full 360° of their circumference, another expensive proposition. Crisp moldings were liable to damage if the bases and capitals were shipped rather than shaped on the construction site. If, as Jefferson wrote in his Notes, “a workman could scarcely be found here capable of drawing an order,” the situation was surely no better for workmen who could dress an Order. How Jefferson envisioned the dissemination of masonry detailing and how the process worked in practice at Jeffersonian courthouses must remain a question for the time being. Still, a large term in the equation was surely the craftsmen whom Jefferson gathered for his building projects, above all for the University of Virginia. Such men had to migrate to make a living.

Jefferson succeeded in enlarging and refining the custom of building brick courthouses. [He drew masons to him, retrained them ?, and let them go their way.] He abandoned the Palladian stuccoed façade, with its effect of a single, homogeneous material, and he accepted an a vivacious Anglo-Americanism, brick walls with vividly contrasting pale trim (fgis. 000....). For the Orders he found salvation in the Palladian stuccoed shaft, and he was right in deciding on the chiseled freestone base and the chiseled freestone capital, above which wood continued to reign as the material for entablatures and gables.

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

- A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787)
- B. Jefferson and the Orders
- C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
- D. Jefferson and Models
- E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
- F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
- G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
- H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
- I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

II. D. Jefferson and Models

[Next section raises issue of whether "Buckingham" courthouse design = generic. This sect. prepares for that.]

Jefferson is popularly associated with inventiveness. In architecture, at least, it would be wiser to associate him with the judicious use of the principle of imitation from one end of his designing career to the other. The issue |centers on the idea of models. Some of the Jefferson's recourse to the principle of setting models is well known but little analyzed; other evidence has not been cited prominently. Even a brief chronological sampling of the Jefferson's diverse applications of the principle of imitation forcibly demonstrates how how fundamental the principle of setting models was to him. His activities with setting models reveal a rich play of ideas that he got from European sources and ideas that came from his American surroundings.

STICK AS CLOSELY AS POSSIBLE TO CHRON

One must start the chronology by acknowledging a custom in Jefferson's background that has not received adequate recognition in writings on American architecture. This custom is, in the words of Dell Upton, "the traditional practice of modeling a new building on a standing one."

The custom was a standard one in America before the twentieth century and no doubt represented merely the transplanting of European practice. The record is strong for public buildings and particularly strong for Virginia courthouses.¹⁷

The case of Albemarle County's three courthouses offers a particularly neat set of illustrations of the practice. Samuel Scott built the first courthouse around 1745. At the wish of the justices (who included Peter Jefferson, father of the infant Thomas), the building was modeled on the first Goochland County Courthouse, which had been constructed by James Shelton beginning in late 1730 or 1731. William Cabell built the second Albemarle County Courthouse in 1762, modeling the new building on the recent Henrico County Courthouse (which had already served as the prototype for the first Chesterfield County Courthouse of 1749-50).¹⁸

The story of the third Albemarle courthouse is more intricate (fig. 26). John Jordan erected the building in 1803 after plans drawn up by George Divers, William D. Meriwether, and

¹⁷For Upton's phrasing, see his Holy Things and Profane: Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia, Architectural History Foundation Books, 10 (New York, 1986), 31, with examples ibid. and passim. PROOFED. I am grateful to Carl L. Lounsbury, [CURRENT TITLE], Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, for discussing with me the habit of specifying that a new building imitate an extant one from Medieval England onward. For examples of the custom of basing a new Virginia building or part of it on a standing structure, see Lounsbury, ed., An Illustrated Glossary of Early Southern Architecture & Landscape, with editorial assistance by Vanessa E. Patrick (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), under "Model," and Marcus Whiffen, "The Early County Courthouses of Virginia," Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 18 (March 1959):2-10. For a sample of the practice outside Virginia, see the eighty-six cases that Peter Benes reports from the written record in "The Templeton 'Run' and the Pomfret 'Cluster': Patterns of Diffusion in Rural New England Meetinghouse Architecture, 1647-1822," Old-Time New England 68 (Winter-Spring 1978):1-21. In "The Building Career of George Winston (1759-1826)" (M. A. thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University, for deposit in December 2003), my student James Martyn Bodman will present a revealing cache of Central Virginia documents that demonstrate the strength of the custom by showing the practice at work in private commissions, for which records survive more rarely than in the case of public buildings.

¹⁸On these episodes, see pp. 6-7 of William H. Gaines, Jr., "Courthouses of Goochland and Albemarle Counties," Virginia Cavalcade 17 (Spring 1968):4-11, and p. 32 of Gaines, "Courthouses of Henrico and Chesterfield," Virginia Cavalcade 17 (Winter 1968): 30-37.

Isaac Mills. Current historians suspect that the original form of this extant but much-altered building belonged to the “Town Hall” class of courthouse. The Town Hall pattern is most recognizable for a façade with a two-story-and-attic gabled front incorporating a ground-level arcade or loggia (fig. 27 FAIRFAX), that is, the façade bears some resemblance to the fronts of many traditional British town halls (fig. 28 MORRIS Pl. 44). The Town Hall pattern had made its appearance in Virginia just before Albemarle’s third courthouse, first with James Wren’s design for the Fairfax County Courthouse (1799; FIG. 27), and second with the construction of the district courthouse in Prince William County at Haymarket (1802), attributed to Wren. Having reached Charlottesville, the Town Hall pattern radiated from it. In 1821-22 the Albemarle building competed as the model for the new Buckingham County Courthouse against a temple-form design provided by Jefferson (fig. 29-30 KIMBALL 214-215). After a near-victory for the Albemarle exemplar, the Buckinghamites changed their minds, expanded Jefferson’s temple, and raised a building that in its turn served as model for other courthouses (fig. 31 BRIAN BATES—MUST REQUEST). The influence of the Albemarle County structure had probably only just begun, however. For instance, one suggests that a series of Town-Hall-style courthouses by or attributed to Jefferson’s workmen William B. Phillips and Malcolm Crawford – for Madison County (1829-30), Caroline County (ca. 1830; fig. 32 WATSON), and Page County (finished 1834) -- are at least in part “corrected” versions of the courthouse in Charlottesville.¹⁹

¹⁹For the current state of understanding of the third Albemarle County Courthouse and the Town Hall pattern I have used Delos Hughes, “The Courthouses of Buckingham County,” typescript, [ca. 1997], 7, 10, and Peters and Peters, *Virginia’s Courthouses* [FIRST REF?], esp. 35-41. On Wren I am indebted to Kathryn Campbell, “James Wren (1728-1815), Architect of Colonial Virginia,” research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003. For the Buckingham County Courthouse see Section I below; on the Crawford and Phillips courthouses, see section WHAT IS LAST CHAP? below.

How Jefferson first encountered the practice of modeling new buildings on extant ones remains undocumented, but the circumstances of his early exposure are probably not material. What does matter is that the procedure was commonplace and that Jefferson understood how to use the custom to disseminate his reforms. The present section will conclude with the ripest piece of documentary evidence as to how the custom worked to spread Jefferson's kind of design.

It is not yet clear how Jefferson saw his buildings as models for building technique. From first to last, though, Jefferson saw at least his major designs and probably all his architectural opportunities as chances to set models for the Orders. That is, his designs are what we can call "Museums of the Orders" -- he did not name the practice himself.²⁰

It seems most likely that Jefferson's designing career began with the first house at Monticello (1769ff.; fig. 8 MONTI MODEL). It also seems most likely that the Jeffersonian Museum of the Orders began here, although questions remain for study: when exactly did Jefferson take this step, and did he know European prototypes for the practice? The details of how his canon of the Orders evolved during his lifetime also require clarification, but about this we do know a good deal. If we combine the first design for the body of the house (fig. 8) with Jefferson's list of "Orders of the Rooms" we get a simple reading: Jefferson now as thereafter favored the Orders of the great Modern, Palladio (or, rather, the Orders of Palladio as altered by Leoni) over the Orders of the Ancients. Conspicuously, the most formal parts of house were to provide the sequence of Palladio's Doric, Ionic and Corinthian in quick succession -- a portico with the Doric of Palladio downstairs and the Ionic of Palladio upstairs, leading almost immediately into a parlor adorned with Palladio's Corinthian entablature. Jefferson meant to use

²⁰I first proposed the "Museum of the Orders" interpretation in [MVA. FILL IN PAGES.]

numerous other Ancient and Modern Orders (mostly as entablatures or perhaps even just cornices, without columns or pilasters). Jefferson relegated the Tuscan to two outbuildings and for these locations specified a pair of ancient Tuscan that Palladio illustrated. Jefferson did not finish building Monticello I, and he seems to have failed to execute much if any of his internal Museum of the Orders. He also envisioned a wholly unexecuted second Museum of the Orders for Monticello I. At an uncertain date he devised an Observation Tower which he meant, after an ill-conceived fashion, to display a full set of five Orders.²¹

Jefferson became a designer because he had no other way of getting architecture for his own house. He advanced into civic design because he saw no other way of getting architecture for public buildings. His concern to set models becomes well documented with the Virginia State Capitol (1785 ff.; fig. 4). Near the outset, fighting for his design, Jefferson asked both James Madison and Edmund Randolph “how is a taste in this beautiful art to be formed in our countrymen, unless we avail ourselves of every occasion when public buildings are to be erected, of presenting . . . models for . . . study and imitation?” Jefferson had in mind setting an example of ideal proportions overall. After construction, he wrote that the Richmond Capitol “is on the

²¹Thomas Jefferson's Monticello (Charlottesville: Thomas Jefferson Foundation, 2002) is the most recent monograph on the subject. It does not discuss Jefferson's compendium of the Orders except in an unsigned and highly popularized section on 36. For the Museum of the Orders interpretation of the first house at Monticello, see pp. 331-37 in Brownell, "Thomas Jefferson's Architectural Models and the United States Capitol," in A Republic for the Ages: The United States Capitol and the Political Culture of the Early Republic, edited by Donald R. Kennon (Charlottesville: published for the United States Capitol Historical Society by the University Press of Virginia, 1999), 316-401. This essay includes an annotated transcription of Jefferson's "Orders of the Rooms," from a problematic notebook apparently dating largely from the mid-1770s or after. See also Making of Virginia Architecture, Survey No. 8 (Monticello, First House) and No. 7 (Monticello, Observation Tower). William L. Beiswanger [CURRENT TITLE] has pointed out to me in conversation that, because of the tower's intended site overlooking the house, the Orders (which Jefferson meant merely to have sawn in silhouette from boards) would have been quite indistinguishable.

model of the temples of Erectheus at Athens, of Balbec, and of the Maison quarrée of Nisme . . . which . . . are considered as the most perfect examples of Cubic architecture, as the Pantheon of Rome is of the Spherical.” (Jefferson’s writings and recent scholarship reveal that he turned to other ancient models, too, such as fig. 1 TEMPLE JUP) Jefferson’s concern for “Cubic” proportions, although highly germane to the story of Jeffersonian courthouses, must be left to another writer to unriddle.²²

Jefferson’s goal of forming a Museum of the Orders is a different matter, even though the clearest information comes from before Design 3, the final phase of the Capitol design. As of Design 2, Jefferson prepared a set of specifications, his “Notes explicatives des plans du Capitole pour l’état de la Virginie” (1785), for his French helper, Charles-Louis Clérissieu. Jefferson stipulated a generous collection of Palladian Orders, many in the form of entablatures only. He meant the internal culmination to come in a fine, lofty hall around the Jean-Antoine Houdon statue of George Washington, with a Leoni-Palladio Ionic colonnade downstairs under a Leoni-Palladio Corinthian colonnade upstairs. As to the Tuscan, Jefferson reserved entablatures in this Order for lesser rooms and did not identify which of Palladio’s alternatives he wanted. Internally, Capitol Design 3 (fig. 33 McROBERTS) very likely incorporated much the same group of Orders as those of the “Notes explicatives,” whereas externally the Ionic Order underwent a development that we still understand only imperfectly. In the execution of the

²²For Jefferson to Madison and Randolph, see Papers, 8:534-39. For the current understanding of the design of the Virginia State Capitol, see Brownell, “Introduction to the 2002 Edition,” in Fiske Kimball, The Capitol of Virginia: A Landmark of American Architecture, edited by Jon Kukla, with Martha C. Vick and Sarah Shields Driggs, revised and expanded edition (Richmond: Library of Virginia, 2002), xv-xxxi, with the source and corrected reading of the passage on Cubic models discussed in n. 2; and F. Carey Howlett, “Revealing Jefferson’s Model for the Capitol of Virginia,” ibid., 49-63. See also Brownell in Making Virginia Architecture, Survy Nos. 9-10. The decoder of what Jefferson meant by “Cubic architecture” is Justin Gunther [CITE CONFERENCE PAPER] whose planned Ph. D. dissertation in Art History at Virginia Commonwealth University will set the understanding of the Richmond Capitol on a fresh footing.

Capitol (1786-98) and its rebuilding and enlargement (1904-06), the building diverged from Jefferson's intentions for the Orders. The extreme case is the Adamesque Tuscan of the first-floor window and door surrounds (fig. 21), an original feature with wildly unorthodox attenuated shafts throughout and an utterly crude handling at the main entry.²³

The sequel to creating a capital city in Richmond came in Washington, D.C. For the national capital Secretary of State Jefferson strove diligently to see Ancient and Modern exemplars set, sometimes with little success. In a celebrated letter to Pierre Charles L'Enfant of 10 April 1791, Jefferson advised that "whenever it is proposed to prepare plans for the Capitol, I should prefer the adoption of some one of the models of antiquity which have had the approbation of thousands of years; and for the President's house I should prefer the celebrated fronts of Modern buildings which have already received the approbation of all good judges." On the same day, Jefferson suggested to President George Washington a means of providing Modern domestic models that might "decide the taste of the new town." Jefferson proposed engraving copies of European prints that he had collected of "a dozen or two of the handsomest fronts of private buildings" and giving the copies away.²⁴

²³Jefferson's "Notes explicatives" (N271) are MS 9374 in the collections of the Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, San Marino, California. CHECK KIMBALL 2002 LEST I STUMBLE OVER DESIGN 2A vs. DESIGN 2B. AREN'T THE "NOTES" 2a? BUT DOES THIS MATTER HERE? 1786-98 STILL = GOOD EXECUTION DATES?—CHECK JUSTIN. For details on the Museum-of-the-Orders scheme, see Brownell, "Jefferson's Models," 338-41. "Jefferson's Design of the Capitol of Virginia" (Master of Architectural History thesis, University of Virginia, 1991), by Brien J. Poffenberger, the virtual discoverer of the "Notes explicatives," remains a valuable resource.

²⁴"Jefferson's Models." For 1791 Apr 10 TJ (Phila) to L'Enfant, see [MICRO ED; Boyd ed., 20:86; for 1791 Apr 10 TJ (Phila) to Washington, see [CITE MICRO FIRST] and (Boyd ed., 20:87-88) [GW text = proofed w. E. Schmelzer, and cp'd w. text in Wash.] For this letter see also George Washington, *The Papers of George Washington*, edited by Dorothy Twohig and others, Presidential Series, vol. 8, edited by Mark A. Mastromarino and Jack D. Warren, Jr. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999), 77-80, which varies insignificantly in the transcription. The editors (80 n. 6) agree with the present writer's belief that Jefferson's suggestion bore no fruit.

The suggestion of distributing prints came to nothing, but Jefferson wielded a profound influence over the architecture of the Federal City because he set models. Through this technique Jefferson in fact functioned as an architect of the national Capitol, just as fully as anyone who formally held the office. To say it again, Jefferson's hierarchy seems to have called for the greatest new buildings, such as the Capitol, to imitate the form of the greatest ancient buildings, which normally meant temples. It is almost surely because of Jefferson's use of ancient exemplars that we have the Capitol Rotunda, a survival of his idea of modeling the entire building on the Pantheon in Rome, the great specimen of "Spherical" architecture of which Jefferson wrote. It is definitely to Jefferson's imitative practices that we owe the magnificent East Portico, for which he set Latrobe the model of a reconstruction of a reputed "Portico of Diocletian" (fig. 34). Jefferson's idea of a Museum of the Orders reached a realization (1815 ff.) in the extant form of the three greatest Neoclassical interiors in the nation, the Doric Courtroom (fig. 35), the Ionic Senate Chamber (now the Old Senate Chamber), and the Corinthian Hall of Representatives (now Statuary Hall), although Latrobe rather than Jefferson decided on the Orders that these chambers display. And these instances are only part of the story of how Jefferson's models shaped the Capitol.²⁵

One rung down his architectural hierarchy, Jefferson seems to have taken Palladio's Villa Rotonda (in its Leoni version, fig. 2) as the ideal pattern for a magistrate's house. He failed to have his versions of the Villa Rotonda theme accepted for the Governor's Mansion in Richmond and for the President's House in Washington (fig. 4) although he succeeded in molding the latter edifice in ways not germane here. At least as interesting as these failures is another one, a tantalizing special case from 1803. In that year Robert Mills, serving as Jefferson's draftsman

²⁵For a part of the evidence from the huge topic of Jefferson's impact on the national Capitol, see Brownell, "Jefferson's Models."

(not his pupil), made a set of presentation drawings for a Jefferson design under the provocatively generic title “Building suited to a Public Officer” (fig. 6). At least as of 1803 one has to ask whether Jefferson had begun to design generic models independent of any single application.²⁶

On a rung of Jefferson’s hierarchy below a civil official’s dwelling stood the private house, an architectural genre to which Jefferson gave freer forms rather than imitating Modern models whole. Such was Monticello II (1796-1809; figs. 000...). The main application of the model principle at the second house is that Jefferson at last made his home a liberally outfitted museum of the Orders. To this day one enters via a portico in the Doric, steps into an Entrance Hall in the Ionic, and reaches a Parlor in the Corinthian, the Orders deriving from the Leoni Palladio and, in the latter two cases, taking the form of entablatures embellished with friezes from ancient buildings. The roster of Orders goes on from there. Variations on Palladian Tuscan, the Order of greatest interest in a study of Jeffersonian courthouses, appear in less important areas.²⁷

We can glimpse Jefferson’s means for giving these elements influence. Piquant evidence hints that he may have written a script so that members of his household could guide visitors through his collections, including his collection of the Orders; certainly an inventory of the

²⁶NEED I GIVE READER SOME CITATION FOR GOV MANSION AND WHITE HOUSE? For the “Building suited to a Public Officer, see Brownell in Making Virginia Architecture, 158-59 and n. 45. In a 1991 seminar presentation, my University of Virginia graduate student Donald W. Matheson proposed that Jefferson made the “Public Officer” design as “a model for seats of government in the Northwest and Louisiana Territories” (1). BRYAN GREEN WASN’T SOLD. ADD FULL MATHESON CITATION IF HE THINKS THIS = WORTHWHILE. CHECK MOST RECENT MILLS LIT., HOWEVER TRASHY: BRYAN, LISCOMBE.

²⁷On the slippery issue of the identity of the Orders inside Monticello II, see Brownell, “Jefferson’s Models,” 341-44. See also Making of Virginia Architecture, Survey No. 12.

Orders on display made its way from Monticello into a series of publications in English and French. We know that in at least one case and probably more Jefferson arranged for other householders to get composition friezes from the molds that he had had made for the Monticello Orders. In the unquestionable case, helping a former housejoiner of his named James Oldham with the remodeling of a Richmond villa called Moldavia, Jefferson did so because, in his own words, “a single example of chaste architecture may guide the taste of the city.”²⁸

Beyond the walls of his house, Jefferson contemplated another kind of architectural museum at Monticello. In his garden he wanted to build pavilions as models of “Cubic” architecture, “Spherical” architecture, and so on. Around 1805, he even contemplated erecting unclassical pavilions, which he called by the word specimen, and classical ones, which he called by the word model. Jefferson’s differentiation in labels between specimen and model, taken with the unclassical designs themselves, suggests that he was considering illustrating bad as well as enlightened style.²⁹

Jefferson’s method of setting models with his buildings reached its summit at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville (1817 ff.; (fig. 11 BÖYE VIEW; fig. 15 DORIC; fig. 35 TUSCAN). Here he even managed at last to create a model of “Spherical” architecture in the form

²⁸On the the hypothetical script and the use of the molds at Moldavia in 1805 and probably at the Albemarle County villa Farmington in 1803, see Brownell, “Jefferson’s Models,” 344-48. Jefferson’s comment on “a single example of chaste architecture” appears in his letter of 19 January 1805 to James Oldham regarding Moldavia (extant in in two copies [CHECK THIS], at the University of Virginia Library, reel 5, and the Library of Congress, reel 31). On Moldavia see now also [JURGENS THESIS; BROWNELL AND JURGENS in LVA 41, and Bodman’s forthcoming “Career of Winston.”

²⁹On the unclassical architectural specimens that Jefferson proposed for his grounds, see pp. 183-84, 185 of William L. Beiswanger, “The Temple in the Garden: Thomas Jefferson’s Vision of the Monticello Landscape,” *Eighteenth Century Life*, n. s., 8 (January 1983):170-88, and Beiswanger, “Thomas Jefferson’s Designs for Garden Structures at Monticello” (Master of Architectural History thesis, University of Virginia, 1977), 24-26, 33-34, 61, and figs. 29-32. Jefferson’s notes, reproduced in Beiswanger, “Jefferson’s Designs,” 61, and Kimball, *Jefferson*, fig. 161, seem to employ the term Gothic not in the modern stylistic sense but in an older pejorative sense.

of the University Rotunda. More to the present point is his lavish display of the Orders for – as he repeatedly wrote -- teaching purposes. Jefferson's celebrated letter to Latrobe of 12 June 1817 might seem to say it all: the University pavilions "should be models of taste and correct architecture, and of a variety of appearance, no two alike, so as to serve as specimens of the orders for the architectural lectures [emphasis added]." As an early University document, however, the letter cannot convey the abundance of samples that in the long run Jefferson spread out, outdoors and indoors, for his supreme exhibition of the Orders. In all this wealth of examples, a special place went to the humble but handsome Palladian Tuscan of Fréart de Chambray (figs. 19, 35). More than 150 freestanding columns of this Order parade along the East and West Lawns, and that is not to count the lesser manifestations of this Tuscan, such as the bold entablatures of the East and West Ranges.³⁰

What a range of techniques we have seen Jefferson contemplate for setting models: dwellings, garden structures, statehouses, the free distribution of engravings, a plausibly generic design, a probable tour script, access to composition molds, and an entire university complex – this list is lengthy, ingenious, and by no means complete. If we end this section as we began it, we can see the force of one of the most effective means on which Jefferson counted, the habit of modeling new buildings on standing ones.

³⁰On the University of Virginia, see [CITE ANYTHING AMONG MOST RECENT PUBLICATIONS?]; and Making of Virginia Architecture, Survey Nos. 26-28. For Jefferson's letter to Latrobe, see B. Henry Latrobe, The Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe, microfiche edition, edited by Thomas E. Jeffrey (Clifton, New New Jersey: James T. White & Company, for the Maryland Historical Society, 1976), 232/F3, annotated in Latrobe, The Correspondence and Miscellaneous Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe, edited by John C. Van Horne at al., 3 vols., The Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe, Series 4, Correspondence and Miscellaneous Papers (New Haven: Yale University Press, for The Maryland Historical Society, 1984-88), 3:901-03. THIS IS NOT FIRST CITATION OF THESE TWO SOURCES, SO MOVE IT BACK TO THE FIRST. INDICATE THAT AM CITING BOTH BECAUSE ONLY THE MICROFICHE IS AUTHORITATIVE FOR TEXT, BUT LETTERPRESS GIVES ANNOTATIONS? OPTION: and compare Jefferson to Dr. William Thornton, 9 May 1817, in IS THIS IN HARRIS EDITION YET?

The case in point comes from the end of Jefferson's life and entails the chain Jefferson-Buckingham-Goochland-Fluvanna. This case is documented by the specifications written by the commissioners charged with building the third Goochland County Courthouse in late 1825 or early 1826 (fig. 37). The specifications were largely followed in the creation of the Goochland building, one of the finest Jeffersonian courthouses, which Dabney Cosby and Valentine Parrish constructed in 1826–27 (fig. 24 DHR—HEAD-ON).. These specifications call for a building very much like [DOUBLECHECK] an undated and probably generic courthouse design by Jefferson, a drawing with specifications that has survived among his papers and will be discussed shortly (figs. 00-00 K214-215). One reason for the similarity between the extant building and the Jefferson design has become evident. The Goochland specifications stipulate “the jury rooms to be on a plan taken in part from the plan of the Buckingham Courthouse herewith shown.”³¹

Thanks to two as-yet-unpublished research projects, the Buckingham tie begins to make sense. Delos Hughes's study of the Buckingham Courthouse [IF I HAVE HIS PERMISSION TO CITE HIS FINDINGS] cautiously proposes that Dabney Cosby was the “undertaker” or contractor for this lost building of 18–2 , with Valentine Parrish and William A. Howard as subcontractors for the carpentry. Excavations directed by Brian Bates in early 2003 have

³¹The untitled specification are preserved in the Papers of the Cocke Family, No. 640 etc., Box 182, Folder “N.d. Goochland County – Court House Specifications and Roads,” in the Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia Library. In Wood Sweet Swofford Architects, “Goochland County Courthouse,” Historic Structure Report for the Circuit Courthouse; Administrative and Judicial Space Planning Analysis (Charlottesville, 1989), 16, the architectural historian Joseph Michael Lasala attractively dates the specifications between 22 December 1825 and 17 January 1826 but is on uncertain ground in attributing them to William Miller. The quoted passage comes from the second page of the specifications. The most essential documentary literature on Goochland County's courthouses is Helène Barret Agee's minutely documented account in her *Facets of Goochland (Virginia) County's History* (Richmond: Dietz Press, 1962), chap. 6, with revisions by William H. Gaines, Jr., “Courthouses of Goochland and Albemarle Counties,” *Virginia Cavalcade* 17 (Spring 1968):4-11, and Elie Weeks, “The Early Courthouses of Goochland,” *Goochland County Historical Society Magazine* 7 (Autumn 1975):6-11.

disclosed that the core of the Buckingham courthouse followed Jefferson's courthouse design in many essentials, no doubt because Jefferson sent a lost copy of his extant drawing and specifications to Buckingham. The Buckingham commissioners, however, framed the Jeffersonian temple with colonnaded walks leading to square, pavilion-style offices (fig. 31 BRIAN BATES).³²

In other words, the core of the Buckingham County Courthouse was a Jefferson design the execution of which is tentatively attributable to much the same team that would build Goochland. The composers of the Goochland specifications had got a drawing of the Buckingham plan, perhaps even Jefferson's own drawing. The Goochland officials attached this drawing to their specifications or copied it there, and they cited the Buckingham drawing for an as-yet-unidentified handling of the jury rooms that Jefferson did not mention in the surviving copy of his specifications. So far, so good: Jefferson made a design, it was adapted for Buckingham County, and the Buckingham County adaptation became the basis for the Goochland specifications and the Goochland temple of justice. Moreover, in 1826 the Goochlanders temporarily considered adding a pair of 16" x 18" offices "to be united to the Courthouse." This unexecuted proposal sounds very much like a derivative of the [16" x 16"?] offices that the Buckingham commissioners added to Jefferson's temple there, as Brian Bates has discovered.³³

³²I am grateful to Delos Hughes TITLE for sharing with me his manuscript "The Courthouses of Buckingham County" (ca. 1997), and to Brian Bates TITLE. These new sources obviate the germane portions of William H. Gaines, Jr., "Buckingham and Appomattox Courthouses" Virginia Cavalcade 17 (Spring 1968):32-39.

³³For the proposal to add the offices at Goochland, see Goochland County Court Order Book [WHAT IS CORRECT TITLE?], 31 (1825-31), 69 (order of 21 August 1826, treating the proposed additions as clerk's offices) and 82 (order of 18 September 1826, speaking of the additions merely as "offices" and guaranteeing the right of the County Clerk, William Miller, to keep his office at his house. [ERIKA PLEASE X.]

But there is more. The surviving version of the Goochland specifications is not the original, which has disappeared. The surviving text is a copy sent in December, 1829, to a former member of Jefferson's circle, General John Hartwell Cocke. Cocke, a distinguished amateur architect, obviously wanted the specifications to study in his current task of designing the Fluvanna County Courthouse at Palmyra, Virginia. The Fluvanna building (fig. 38) would be constructed in 1830-31 by Walker Timberlake [A TJ WORKMAN?], perhaps with the assistance of a former Jefferson workman, William B. Phillips. Aside from its ornaments, Cocke's temple follows [DOUBLECHECK] much the same pattern as Jefferson's design, as the Buckingham courthouse, and as the Goochland courthouse. Pregnantly, Cocke's copy of the Goochland specifications is not just any kind of a copy but an official transcript. It was provided by Cocke's peer, Colonel William Bolling, presiding justice in Goochland for many years and one of the commissioners who had just built the Goochland Courthouse. The transcript was prepared by Narcissus W. Miller, the Deputy Clerk of the County, son of William Miller, who was not only the County Clerk but also another of the commissioners for building Goochland's courthouse. In transcribing the document for a fee, the younger Miller was performing one of the standard tasks of a county clerk. Thus we see the chain -- Jefferson design, Buckingham adaptation of Jefferson's outlines, Goochland adaptation of the Buckingham outlines, and Fluvanna adaptation of the pattern. Thus, too, we see how the chain was forged by the custom of imitating standing buildings, facilitated by the possibility of getting official transcripts of documents, a circumstance easily overlooked today. After all, if Cocke had not saved his own copy of the Goochland specifications, we would not know those specifications at all.³⁴

³⁴A series of historians such as Helène Barret Agee have searched through the Goochland records without finding the original courthouse specifications. Most recently, Erika S. A. Moore examined the Goochland documents on microfilm at the Library of Virginia during the summer of 2003. I am grateful to Phyllis B. Silber, Executive Director of the Goochland County Historical Society, and Lee G.

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

- A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787)
- B. Jefferson and the Orders
- C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
- D. Jefferson and Models
- E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
- F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
- G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
- H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
- I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

II. E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson

[Use two epigraphs -- Hughes and Peters quotation on central role of courthouse in VA life. Hughes 17

"The county court was the center of public life for most Virginians during Thomas Jefferson's entire life and approached his ideal of self-government more closely than any other institutional form."

Delos Hughes, "The Charlotte County Courthouse:
Attribution and Misattribution in Jefferson Studies" (1993).³⁵

Turner, Clerk of Circuit Court, the County of Goochland, for sharing their view that that the original specifications are unlikely to be traceable. As a transcription the surviving specifications do not contain the drawing of Buckingham that accompanied the original. Both Miller and Bolling annotated the transcript as to changes made during construction. I thank John and Margaret Peters for discussing with me. . . . On the Fluvanna County Courthouse, see Muriel B. Rogers, "John Hartwell Cocke (1780-1866) and Philip St. George Cocke (1809-1861): From Jeffersonian Palladianism to Romantic Colonial Revivalism in Antebellum Virginia" (Ph. D. diss., Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003), 77-86 and Appendix B, 343-48, reproducing the Goochland specifications. On Bolling see Barry A. Crouch, "Bolling, William," in *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, edited by John T. Kneebone and others, 2 vols. to date (Richmond: Library of Virginia, 1998-). On William Miller, founding member of a remarkable family of Goochland clerks, see pp. 2-3 of "Early Officials of Goochland County," *Goochland County Historical Society Magazine* 1 (Autumn 1969):1-7, and Agee, *Facets, passim* but esp. 49, 172; also CeCe Bullard with Margaret Henley Walker and Eve Barenholtz, *Goochland, Yesterday and Today: A Pictorial History* (Virginia Beach, Virginia: Donning Company, 1994), 107-08, and F. Johnston, *Memorials of Old Virginia Clerks* (Lynchburg: J. P. Bell Company, 1888) 189, 191.

³⁵ Arris 4:17

[Summarize work of others, starting with ~~Carl Lounsbury's new book~~ NOT AVAILABLE UNTIL FALL 2004; Peters and Peters; etc. including Whiffen.]

As we have seen, Jefferson condemned Virginia architecture harshly in his Notes on the State of Virginia. Even so, the worst that he had to say against courthouses was that “no attempts are made at elegance,” that is, that courthouses lacked the principal ornament in architecture, the Orders. We can translate Jefferson’s opinion into Vitruvius’ “tripod.” Jefferson condemned Virginia’s courthouses for violating attractiveness, but he did not criticize the utility of their layout or the soundness of their construction. In actuality the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries bequeathed to Jefferson quite a promising body of material to reform. During the Colonial Period, the Virginia courthouse had evolved from buildings conceived of as houses of perishable construction into an array of durable, recognizably public buildings. There had occurred a commingling of [?] transplanted Northern European ways, Southern European ways, broadly North American characteristics, and Virginia traits. As a result, the Virginia courthouse had acquired a range of usable plans, a tradition of solid construction, and even a little more of noble ornamentation than Jefferson admitted.

[PLANS.—~~Use Lounsbury to analyze~~. Analyze plan that TJ used (FIG. 39 AMELIA PLAN MVA #4...). Also town hall type (fig. 000. . .) and type w. wings (fig. 40 WMSBURG PETERS) as the three types most (?) susceptible to Jeffersonian Palladian reform. Town hall type emerged just before 1800, competed w. temple, and interacted w. TJ’s prefs. Two features of the highest importance are the apse, from the Roman lawcourt via Inigo Jones, and the piazza or outdoor “room” only slightly above ground level. Bells? Bulletin boards? Piazza seats?]

Construction. [Little needs to be added here since there is a whole section on this.]

Decoration. Even in the realm of “elegance,” the pre-Jefferson Virginia courthouse was by no means as destitute as The Notes on the State of Virginia asserted, for it often had a cornice, and that in turn often means a modillion cornice (fig. 41-42, HANOVER GENERAL & CORNICE PETERS). Be it remembered that in the Classical tradition a cornice is not an independent motif. Rather, this element in an entablature is one of the fundamental parts of an Order. When a cornice is used by itself – at least when it is used with literate moldings – it is an abbreviation or shorthand for a full Order. The modillion cornice was a particular eighteenth-century favorite, conspicuously in the form of Palladio’s Ionic cornice (fig. 43—LEONI IONIC CORNICE JACOB) or variants on that set of moldings, as in the case of the Hanover County Courthouse (ca. 1735), the King William County Courthouse (ca. 1740) [ADD MORE?]. One of Jefferson’s distinctive traits was a preference for full entablatures over their abbreviation into the cornice. In effect, all that he had to do was pull the rest of the Order down from the cornice like a windowshade. Many Jeffersonian courthouses had their Orders unrolled only as far as the bottom of the entablature (fig. 32 CAROLINE CO. – WATSON).³⁶

[CLOSING SUMMARY.]

³⁶This is probably OK if it is OK with Lounsbury new book and if Calder accepts my examples as “period.” Can also cite Lounsbury ed. Glossary under “modillion” for examples.

- II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture
 - A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787)
 - B. Jefferson and the Orders
 - C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
 - D. Jefferson and Models
 - E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
 - F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
 - G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
 - H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
 - I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

- II. F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)

If one is to make progress with understanding Jefferson's reform of the Virginia courthouse, one must examine two neglected bodies of evidence. One body of evidence is two pieces of paper (figs. 000-000), once attached to each other by wax, later glued back to back, and conveniently called K214-K215. This document matters because it is probably Jefferson's generic model for the Virginia courthouse. The other body of evidence is the lost Loudoun County Courthouse of 1809-11 (fig. LOUDON LATROBE'S VIEW), examined in the next section of this report. This building matters because it was the earliest Jeffersonian courthouse in Virginia.³⁷

Our first body of material, K214-K215, raises questions, but its significance is still probably simple. As other historians have adumbrated or proposed, the document is most likely to be Jefferson's design, not for a specific location, but for a model Virginia courthouse, to be executed as opportunities arose. Reviewing the two sheets will illustrate how Jefferson inserted a traditional Virginia courthouse plan inside a temple-like container that obeyed the principles of

³⁷Hughes, "Courthouses," PAGE, pointed out that K214-K215 are two decidedly different pieces of paper.

permanent structure and ornament drawn from the Orders. He had done this before on a giant scale with his Virginia State Capitol designs of 1785, and now he did this again. Indeed, the confluence of elements is even richer than such a summary statement suggests.³⁸

Publishing the Coolidge collection of Jefferson's architectural drawings in 1916, Fiske Kimball introduced the pages into the study of American architecture and catalogued them as 214-215. The front of the pair (K214) bears Jefferson's only plan for a courthouse, drawn on a printed grid; the back (K215) has Jefferson's specifications for the design, written on plain paper. Jefferson did not label or date the document; both sheets contain evident second thoughts; the drawing is unfinished; the specifications offer no functional analysis; and the plan exemplifies how maddeningly unclear Jefferson's self-taught conventions for drawing can be.³⁹

Kimball wrongly supposed that he had solved the essential problems of the sheet when he identified it as a design for the Buckingham County Courthouse (fig. 000). Kimball pointed to Jefferson's correspondence (1821-22) with his friend Colonel Charles Yancey of Buckingham. The exchange of letters demonstrates that Jefferson did prepare a design for the Buckingham County Courthouse, and that the County chose to modify the design with Jefferson's acquiescence. Nonetheless, in one of the publications that marked the renaissance of Jefferson

I follow him in believing that they belong together.

³⁸[LIST IN CHRON ORDERS THE SOURCES THAT HAVE TOUCHED ON IDEA OF MODEL PLAN. THEY INCLUDE: Peters and Peters?; Hughes, "Courthouses," 23-24, also pointing ; John Peters in ARTH 789; D., HUGHES, P. 11, PARA 1, BROACHES GENERIC DESIGN ISSUE, BUT DIFFERENTLY. BOTETOURT COULD HAVE TAKEN 6 WEEKS IN 1818. THIS BODES ILL FOR IDEA OF PREEXISTING TJ DESIGN. BUT BOTETOURT MAY NOT HAVE BEEN ON TEMPLE PLAN (?) On the current understanding of the Richmond Capitol, see Brownell, Introduction to Fiske Kimball, The Capitol of Virginia: A Landmark of American Architecture, edited by Jon Kukla, with Martha C. Vick and Sarah Shields Driggs, revised and expanded edition (Richmond: Library of Virginia, 2002), xv-xxxix. I hope to see this discussion superseded in the near future by the work of Justin Gunther.

³⁹GIVE KIMBALL CITATION, NICHOLS NO., AND MASS HISTORICAL NO. MUST CHECK REMARKS AGAINST DRG AT MASS HIST.

architectural studies during the last fifteen years, Delos Hughes demonstrated that K214-K215 [REDO WORDING FROM HUGHES ARTICLE does not record Jefferson's thinking for the Buckingham County Courthouse and tallies closely with the Charlotte County Courthouse].⁴⁰

K214-K215 will not soon give up the secrets of its fabrication, but one can make headway. The paper of the drawing is an example of the coordinate or graph paper that Jefferson discovered in France and began using no later than 1785. The drawing, then, cannot predate Jefferson's European years. This sheet unquestionably shows how to insert customary features of a Virginia courthouse inside a container shaped along the lines of a temple with a four-column or tetrastyle portico. We can learn more by touring the design as if it were a standing building.⁴¹

We walk through the plan across a grid made of larger squares that mark out 10-foot units, each containing ten smaller, 1-foot squares. At the bottom of the page is an addendum, Jefferson's final thoughts the wall behind the Bench. We shall consider this fragment in its place. The plan proper starts above this emendation.⁴²

We approach the courtroom through a portico of four columns. On K215 Jefferson specified "the Order Tuscan" for this area and, in Palladian tradition, directed "columns of brick plaistered / caps and bases stone." This front area is both a temple portico and an equivalent to

⁴⁰For the reattribution, see Delos Hughes, "The Charlotte County Courthouse: Attribution and Misattribution in Jefferson Studies," *Arris* 4 (1993):8-18.

⁴¹Carl Lounsbury, Architectural Historian, Colonial Williamsburg, kindly assured me in a letter of that [plan is typical of VA courthouses for the preceding 50 years]. On the traditional features of a Virginia courthouse, see Lounsbury, "The Structure of Justice: The Courthouses of Colonial Virginia," in *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, III*, edited by Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman, 214-26 (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press for the Vernacular Architecture Forum, 1989), esp. 219-26. The basic literature on K214-215 is Hughes, "Charlotte County," and Bryan Clark Green, "Thomas Jefferson's Design for the Buckingham County Courthouse," research report, AR H 700 (Brownell), University of Virginia, 1989. I am deeply grateful to John and Margaret Peters for assisting me in unriddling Jefferson's plan in June of 2003. My discussion incorporates many suggestions from them as well as a series of penetrating observations by my graduate student Craig A. Reynolds.

⁴²On the paper, BD in Kimball's classification, see Kimball, 112. BETTER REREAD 105ff.].

the eighteenth-century courthouse “piazza,” a shelter for the public in bad weather and a place where litigants and their attorneys – perhaps hired on the spot – discussed their cases. The specifications call for a 3-foot basement, that is, a substantial podium but not [a tall one?]. Confusingly, Jefferson – whose skill of course did not lie with staircases – has not shown us how we are to ascend this podium to the portico. If Jefferson thought the matter through, he would seem to have meant six steps, each 6” high. In designing the Virginia State Capitol, as scholars have not previously noted, he brought his Temple of Democracy down much closer to ground level than his final model, the Maison Carrée (fig. 44 FOUQUET). Similarly, he proposed elevating his [Temple of Justice?] but not lifting it very high. Economy and the traditional accessibility of Virginia courthouses, which often sat only a little above ground level ((fig. 41 HANOVER GENERAL) may both have been motives.⁴³

Jefferson appears to have drawn this front area well after drawing the body of the building. Certainly the front wall shows where he originally drew four windows, two of which quite unclassically would have aligned with two of the portico columns. Jefferson erased this original fenestration and re-inked the wall with two windows that fall between columns. So egregious a slip and correction tells us that this drawing began as an early study of its subject. At the same time, suffering from an old injury to his wrist that could make writing and drawing painful, Jefferson did not draw needlessly. K214 may well have begun as his first attempt at the subject and have evolved into his final thoughts.⁴⁴

⁴³QUOTATIONS ARE PROOFED. On the uses of older piazzas, see Lounsbury, “Structure,” 220, 22. BETTER CHECK PERRAULT VITRUVIUS ON TUSCAN TEMPLE. The Maison Carrée as illustrated in [CITE CLERISSEAU] has 21 steps to the podium. The steps Jefferson’s third and final design are shown variously: as 8 [?] (K110), 13 [?] (K116), and 13 (the Fouquet plaster model). In execution Jefferson’s design for the podium was changed into a high basement for offices.

⁴⁴Particularly puzzling is Jefferson’s notation “within the portico a socle 8. I[inches]. to make the floor of

Jefferson's dimensions for the body of the building, exclusive of the portico, are 59'6" x 44' inside the walls and 61'8" x 46'2" outside the walls. These dimensions approximate 60' x 45', and the portico is roughly 15' x 45'. These figures raise the question of whether Jefferson saw the design as "Cubic architecture." That is, he may have used graph paper not just to facilitate drawing but, as far as possible, to calculate the design from even multiples and even subdivisions of 10-foot squares.

Through the front door we find the courtroom. Jefferson's amateur code of symbols is sometimes confusing, and he did not render the furnishings of the room completely. Such a space had to accommodate (1. the Bench; (2. the [bailiff? or sheriff?], to keep order; (3. the clerk, to record the proceedings; (4. counsel and clients; (5. witnesses; (6. the jury; and (7. the public.⁴⁵

Immediately in front of us we see the space where the public would stand or possibly sit. Jefferson did not mark the placement of the Bar to tell us that as the lay public we can go no farther. In his specifications, lover of mezzanines and the juggling of floor levels that he was, he referred to the frontmost part of the interior as "2. half stories." We stand in one of these half stories under the other, which is a gallery supported by six columns. The specifications identify the Order of the colonnade as Tuscan.

A pair of staircases leads to this gallery from the courtroom floor. Here, in our second case of heavy erasures, Jefferson scrubbed out the original lines at the upper ends of the staircases, redrawing the steps as tightly winding instead of as forming a straight flight. A dotted line running from stair to stair shows that he wanted to cantilever the gallery out over the Tuscan

the portico 8.I. lower than that of the courtroom."

⁴⁵I am particularly grateful to John O. Peters for his help in analyzing the functional needs of a courtroom.

colonnade. This provision no doubt has some connection with the balconies of some of the University of Virginia pavilions.

On the gallery stand three jury rooms, designated in the specifications as about 14 feet square. To one of these a jury would retire to consider its verdict, at a remove from contact with activities in the courthouse square. In a world of scanty public buildings, jury rooms were also put to “wide and indiscriminate uses” for various office, conference, and storage purposes, particularly because they were heated. In a typical Jeffersonian touch, though, K214 and K215 make no provision for stoves or hearths. Heating was an issue that Jefferson often addressed only late in a design.⁴⁶

When we step into the body of Jefferson’s hall of justice and turn to the difficult task of envisioning what Jefferson meant there, we can get help from a painting of Patrick Henry Arguing the “Parson’s Cause” (fig. 45). The picture, attributed to George Cooke and possibly painted in the 1830s – certainly long after the event that it portrays -- shows a pivotal episode in Henry’s career, an oration that he gave in the Hanover County Courthouse in 1763. The canvas does not tally with the architecture of the Courthouse, so we cannot take the painting as an accurate likeness of the interior at any time, but we can cautiously use it to suggest the generic elements of a traditional Virginia courtroom.⁴⁷

Directly in front of us in Jefferson’s drawing are four bewildering lines. These one-dimensional marks look like some form of seating, but they differ completely from the dotted lines for seating drawn in the apse. The four straight lines make the most sense as an amateur’s

⁴⁶The phrase “wide and indiscriminate uses” comes from Lounsbury, “Structure,” 222.

⁴⁷For Patrick Henry see Virginius Cornick Hall, Jr., comp., Portraits in the Collection of the Virginia Historical Society: A Catalogue (Charlottesville: published for the Virginia Historical Society by the University Press of Virginia, 1981), 114-15; AND? I am grateful to Craig Reynolds for calling my attention to this painting.

notation that the benches for attorneys and their clients belong here, in their customary place – just as in Patrick Henry -- but that the number of benches was to be decided.⁴⁸

Just beyond these seats a polygonal apse enfolds the Bench. Here dotted lines signify a lower and an upper set of seats, similar to those visible in Patrick Henry. The upper seats belong to the judges, the lower ones to the jury. The half-octagon wraps around a central table, placed like the one in Patrick Henry, where the clerk would record the proceedings. At the center of the upper benches, between two windows, a pier rises behind the seat of the chief magistrate, whose chair Jefferson did not mark. The specifications say that “the windows embrac’g the judge’s chair give light & air there,.” and Jefferson’s Notes on the State of Virginia have already given us an instance of the value that he placed on the light and the airy throughout his life. This pier and pair of windows are one of the most traditional elements in the room, but K215 stipulates a Jeffersonian variation, a 10-foot lunette window spanning a 4-foot pier and the 2-foot windows. As shown in the apse, the pier is 6 feet across. The fragmentary wall at the bottom of the page has a 4-foot pier and must be Jefferson’s memorandum of his final preference for the rear wall.⁴⁹

An oddity in K214-215 occurs behind the Bench. Jefferson treated this area as a continuation of the oblong body of the building, tucking his three-sided apse into the squared corners and opening the rectangular walls around this apse into arches. (The insertion of a polygonal bow into a kind of arcade bears some similarity to Monticello’s “caged bow,” a bow inserted inside a portico [fig. 000].) Here is our third case of major erasures. Jefferson erased and redrew the end wall, which he originally spaced like the fragment on the bottom of the page.

⁴⁸I owe the interpretation of the four lines to Craig Reynolds.

⁴⁹USE PETERS AND PETERS RE REDUCTION OF JUDGES AND MAXIMUM NUMBER BEFORE THAT REDUCTION.

He also erased but did not finish redrawing the diagonal walls that look out into the open arches. Jefferson's specifications say that these courthouse arches "are to give light & air thro' the windows of the court [bench?]." The apse would have given more light and air without the rectangular arcade, so Jefferson must have meant shaded light and air, for a Virginia that had little amelioration for baking summer heat.⁵⁰

Such are the internal features of K215-K215. Jefferson, as we have seen, made express provision for (1. the Bench; (3. the clerk; (4. counsel and clients; (6. the jury; and – insofar as he provided space to stand at the rear of the courtroom -- (7. the public. He did not specifically accommodate (2. the [bailiff?]; or (5. witnesses. (At its center Patrick Henry shows us a Virginia witness box.)

One other omission from K214-215 calls for comment: provision for a bell. [FUNCTION OF BELL, PRECISELY?] Jefferson never arrived at a sophisticated way to integrate such a feature into a design and got no further than hanging a bell from the bottom of an entablature. The natural solution would have been to put the bell in a cupola (also called a lantern or lanthorn). Jefferson, however, found cupolas "most offensive" and "one of the degeneracies of modern architecture," as he had informed Latrobe in 1807. Jefferson's successors in designing temple-form Virginia courthouses would face the placement of the bell as a fundamental problem.⁵¹

⁵⁰On Jefferson and the "caged bow," see Brownell in Making of Virginia Architecture, 50 and Survey No. 12.

⁵¹CITE PERIOD VIEW OF ROTA UVA RE DANGLING BELL FROM ENTABL? Jefferson's letter to Latrobe of 22 April 1807, bears quoting on the subject of the "lantern, Cupola, or belfry. I have ever supposed the Cupola an Italian invention, produced by the introduction of bells on the churches and one of the degeneracies of modern architecture." See [MICROF NO.]; cp. Latrobe, Correspondence, 2:410-11. Jefferson may well have owed some of his thinking about cupolas to Palladio's remarks on cupolas as a difference between temples and churches (*Architecture*, book 4, chap. 5, p. 53).

One can summarize the essential traits of the interior of K214 by saying that customary Virginia planning and venerable European ideas flowed together here in an intricate confluence. One cannot separate the apsidal bench from Jefferson's awareness of comparable areas in Roman basilicas, apsed longitudinal buildings with galleries that served as lawcourts. Under Jefferson's nose, in his architectural "Bible," Palladio (as translated by Nicholas Dubois for Leoni) had written of basilica apses (fig. 46 LEONI PALLADIO BK. 3 PL. XVII) that:

. . . in the end opposite to the entrance . . . it would be better to have . . . a great nich [sic] made of a portion of circle . . . , where might stand the *Praetor's* Tribunal, or that of the Judges, if there be many; as there shou'd be an ascent to it by steps, that it might have the more of Majesty and Grandeur.

In Jefferson's courthouse design, he converted the curved apse into a polygonal one that did not require the expense of making curved bricks, and he instated the accustomed Virginia feature of a central pier rising behind the chief magistrate's chair between two windows. Jefferson had once before inserted such a *basilica alla Virginia* – gallery, raised apsidal bench, central pier, twin windows, and all – into a civic temple when he designed the state Capitol in 1785 (fig. 47, KIMBALL 110, DET). He probably recognized that Virginia's apses descended from those of the Romans via European culture.⁵²

So much for the conception itself. One must take very seriously the proposition that K214-K215 is a generic design, for application as needed. One further must take very seriously the proposition that K214-K215 embodies the evolution of Jefferson's ideas about courthouse design from preliminary thoughts to a master model.

⁵²For the quotation, see Palladio, *Architecture*, book 3, chap. 19, p. 33. Green, "Buckingham County Courthouse," 3, opened up the issue of the basilican current in K214, and I am much indebted to his paper. The line of descent for basilican planning in the English-speaking world hypothetically stretched from Inigo Jones and Stuart architecture to the first Williamsburg Capitol (1701-05 [CHECK]).

It is particularly John O. Peters to whom we owe the suggestion that [QUOTE?] Jefferson made K214-K215 as a generic design,⁵³ We can add two pieces of germane evidence that we have recognized. We saw that, by no later than 1791, Jefferson had had the idea of circulating prints as generic models. As of 1803, he had had the professional draftsman Robert Mills make presentation drawings for what may well have been a generic pattern for a magistrate's house (fig. 000). K214-K215 could have been the successful sequel to the two earlier, unrealized projects. The document and its provenance would answer well to the idea of a master copy. The major erasures have revealed the evolution of the drawing from preliminary thinking, while the preservation of this sheet with its specifications would tally with a role as a master version to copy. As to provenance, the pieces came to the Massachusetts Historical Society with a collection of Jefferson's drawings, which is to say it is unlikely that the document left Jefferson's possession during his lifetime. (Almost thirty years of experience with the provenance of early American architectural drawings firmly suggests to the present writer that builders rarely have been so kind as to return to its creator any drawing used in construction.) The pages of K214-K215 have not [??? has it ???] ever been folded, as would have been necessary had Jefferson posted them. Nor would there have been much need to return such a drawing to Jefferson, for he was perfectly capable of reproducing drawings at will, despite his injured wrist. Throughout his life Jefferson followed the traditional practice of pricking his drawings. That is, he used a tool called a pricker [other names] to perforate his drawings with tiny holes. Pricking was first and foremost an almost invisible technique for laying out conceptions with precise measurement, but it was also a means for copying.⁵⁴

⁵³Cite Peters and Peters book; Peters in discussion. Didn't John spell this out first?

⁵⁴Examination of the sheet in July 2003 revealed that On pricking see Brownell in Making of

Let us sum up K214-K215. As if he were sliding a hand into a glove, Jefferson inserted an essentially customary Virginia courthouse plan into a casing like a temple. The temple carcase exemplified his principle of permanent construction (extending to masonry walls and columns but not to vaulting) and it exemplified his principle of “elegance,” that is, of worthy adornment via the Orders. The internal layout had the sanction of long Virginia practice and of older European authority back to the Ancients. The design may further have embodied the proportions of “Cubic” architecture. We shall proceed on the hypothesis that Jefferson did not make this fusion for a specific commission but rather as a model for the reform of Virginia’s most important class of civic building.

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

- A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787)
- B. Jefferson and the Orders
- C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
- D. Jefferson and Models
- E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
- F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
- G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
- H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
- I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

II. G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811).

With K214-K215 out of the way, we can look at our other neglected body of evidence, the lost Loudoun County Courthouse in Leesburg (fig. 48-49 LATROBE DRAWINGS 50 PHOTO). We can call this building an "eloquent muddle." Architecturally the building was an unsightly hodgepodge of elements, truly a muddle. Nonetheless, thanks to Erika Moore's research, the building speaks eloquently about what happened the first known time that Jefferson's conception for the Virginia courthouse reached execution.

The data are few. Loudoun County was created in 1757, and the court's initial quarters, as usual, were temporary. In 1758 the court wrote the specifications for the first proper courthouse, to be a two-story brick structure measuring 40 x 28 feet, with two galleries, a square jury room, and a "circular" justices seat. Aeneas Campbell began building the courthouse in 1758. By the early nineteenth century this first building had needed many repairs. Of the second courthouse the county records indicate only that the structure was raised ca. 1809-11, apparently by one William Wright. On 10 May 1815 Latrobe, passing through Leesburg, was so appalled at the design, particularly the barbarity of the Tuscan portico, that he drew the building

and an annotated detail of the Order, which he contrasted with an orthodox specimen of the Tuscan (figs. 000-000). (With the Bank of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia [1799-1801] Latrobe had just created one of the architectural wonders of the age in America, a white marble temple with a cupola-topped rotunda, constructed according to the highest standards of design and craft (FIG. 51 MVA BANK OF PA). It must have been the contrast between his building and the Leesburg one that seized his attention. As usual, Latrobe sketched on the site, filling in the drawing afterward, and he perpetrated some errors in his view [compare fig. 000].) Leesburg's "eloquent muddle" gave way to the third Loudoun County Courthouse, constructed in 1894-95 to the design of William Callis West of Richmond. Two Tuscan column bases and two Tuscan capitals from the second courthouse survive near the site of the lost building.⁵⁵

One footprint of the building and a miscellany of engravings and photographs survive. The footprint appears on a Sanborn fire insurance map of [1894?], which shows the courthouse as a rectangular brick edifice of 40 x 50 feet, with a 10-foot-deep portico and wooden portico columns. Although the map does not show an apse, this building may have had an apsidal bench encased in the rectangular body. The probable existence of a "circular" bench in the first courthouse increases the plausibility of this idea.⁵⁶

Despite the paucity of data, we can understand a good deal about the patchwork conception of the Leesburg courthouse. In some fashion or other, a courtroom was placed inside a temple-shaped body with a tetrastyle Tuscan portico. This much signifies either of two things. It may signify that William Wright or an associate precociously anticipated the Jeffersonian

⁵⁵On the Leesburg building see Erika S. A. Moore, "Jefferson, Latrobe, and the Lost Loudoun County Courthouse of 1809-1811," research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2002; ; Latrobe's View of America 334-35 [AND PASS?], publishing Latrobe's "Leesburg Courthouse" and his unlabeled detail, Sketchbook 13, 2a and 3, Latrobe Papers, Maryland Historical Society. Cite all Erika's sources.

⁵⁶[FILL IN SANBORN. N. B. WHICH YEAR?]

courthouse, drawing the temple conception from the Richmond capitol, much as eighteenth-century builders had derived their apses and their arcaded piazzas from the first Williamsburg capitol. Alternatively, the Leesburg configuration may mean that Wright worked from a Jefferson design predating Jefferson's documented courthouse-designing activity.

The courthouse sat upon a low podium of two steps, not on the 3-foot basement that Jefferson specifies in K215 (much less a full basement story without steps like the Capitol in Richmond as completed). The lowness of the base suggests that an eighteenth-century taste for low-lying, accessible courthouses had asserted itself (fig. 000), but the Jeffersonian courthouse would come closer still to the ground.

Above the steps, much of the detailing takes its lead from the Adamesque of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Specifically, the portico is Adamesque Tuscan, with columns of some 10 diameters by Latrobe's reckoning. This Order is not merely stiff and unbeautiful but also ungrammatical: as Latrobe noted, the portico had no architrave or frieze, merely a cornice. In line with the Adamesque delight in mixing Orders, the cornice for these Tuscan columns seems to have been Ionic, probably Palladian Ionic. The portico ceiling behind the cornice rested flat on the column capitals, a clumsy treatment recalling the Monticello II porticoes.⁵⁷

William Wright provided for a bell in a most un-Jeffersonian fashion by putting a cupola atop the roof. The old photographs show that Latrobe misrepresented that belfry as octagonal when in fact it was hexagonal. Via an uncertain family tree, this distinctive six-sided cupola probably descended from a trio of hexagonal cupolas erected in Williamsburg around 1700: at the College of William and Mary (), at the Capitol (), and at the Governor's Palace.

⁵⁷Latrobe's notes appear in pencil near the upper lefthand margin of "Leesburg Courthouse." Curiously, the Tuscan temple with only a cornice reappeared shortly afterward at the two end pavilions of Bremon,

Late Stuart in origin, then, the Leesburg cupola was probably dressed up by recourse to the plates of James Gibbs's Book of Architecture (London, 1728).⁵⁸

The Loudoun County Courthouse was an unlovely cut-and-paste assemblage of elements. Which of two possibilities explains how it came to be? Did Wright just so happen to anticipate the Jeffersonian courthouse, perhaps by envisioning a smaller, Tuscan version of the Virginia State Capitol with the functional addition of front steps and a cupola? This is not impossible, but it does seem strained. Given that Virginia was a small world, a different interpretation makes more sense. By this second interpretation, Jefferson had arrived at the essentials of his Tuscan Virginia courthouse, and the idea of combining a the accustomed kind of courtroom with a temple body made its way to Leesburg through the network of the powerful. (It may be significant that that Jefferson's great friend James Monroe had property interests near Leesburg at Oak Hill.) By this reading, when Jefferson's conception reached Loudoun County, it was tricked out with a miscellany of practical and decorative elements that were strikingly unsympathetic to Jefferson's chaste temple.⁵⁹

Whatever the truth about the Loudoun County edifice, this "eloquent muddle" speaks of the alternatives that that stood ready to compete in the design of an early nineteenth-century Virginia courthouse. When you put a courtroom in a temple, to what extent would you make the building of durable materials? Would the structure sit on a modest podium or almost on the ground? What un-Jeffersonian styles would intrude themselves? Would orthodox Orders or Adamesque Orders appear? Would there be a bell and, if so, where would it find a home?

built in Fluvanna County by John Neilson and John Hartwell Cocke in 1816-20.

⁵⁸The bell, which has no maker's mark but reputedly was bought in 1769 for the first courthouse, survives in the Loudoun County Museum.

⁵⁹Monroe acquired Oak Hill by bequest from his uncle in 1898; see . He did not, however, build his villa at Oak Hill until 1820-23.

These issues are leitmotifs that wind through the rise of the later, unquestionably Jeffersonian courthouses.

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

- A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787)
- B. Jefferson and the Orders
- C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
- D. Jefferson and Models
- E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
- F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
- G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
- H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
- I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

II. H.. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe

Sec. 1: Summary.⁶⁰ TJ's great chance to educate architects, to create a model in VA , and to train workmen to execute model. Few of workmen [?] and no alumni built VA courthouses.

TJ retrained workmen. Impact of fusion of TJ's and Latrobe's thinking – esp. the ground level temple -- radiated from UVA to courthouses.

Sec. 2: Jefferson and the workmen

This sect. condenses e.g. Lay, Cote, Green diss. TJ retrained workmen, e.g. according to Cosby's obit TJ retrained Cosby re both architecture and brickwork.. N.B. Blackburn's copying of the Leoni Palladio Orders.

Sec. 3: Jefferson and Latrobe

UVA IS THE FIRST PLACE THAT WE FIND TEMPLE AT GROUND LEVEL WITHOUT EVEN A PRETENSE OF A PODIUM.

Jefferson and Latrobe were so big that American architecture could not escape them and they could not escape each other..

[Recap collaboration at UVA.] Jefferson meant the Pavilions as second-story features standing on top of covered walkways. Latrobe (who had compared this effect to a "litter of pigs" in the case of Jefferson's similar design for the White House wings) sold

⁶⁰Frank E. Grizzard, Jr., "Documentary History of the Construction of the Buildings of the University of Virginia" (Ph. D. diss., University of Virginia, 1996)

Jefferson on Latrobe's alternative, full-height temple-form Pavilion facades rising from the first story. Latrobe apparently meant these temples to rest on a continuous podium. Jefferson omitted the podium and translated the Pavilions into temples resting on the ground itself, a novel treatment profoundly unlike the normal Classical temple. From these Jefferson-Latrobe models that Jefferson set at the University, the idea of the highly accessible ground-level temple rapidly passed into the Jeffersonian courthouse.

Sec. 2: Jefferson and the workmen

This sect. condenses e.g. Lay, Cote, Green diss. TJ retrained workmen, e.g. according to Cosby's obit TJ retrained Cosby re both architecture and brickwork.. N.B. Blackburn's copying of the Leoni Palladio Orders.

According to Cosby's 1862 obituary:

More than sixty years ago Mr. Cosby, when a young man, worked on the University of Virginia, under the direction and superintendence of Mr. Jefferson. We have often heard him speak of his conversations with that illustrious man, and of the information he received from him in architecture and the art of making brick.

We could almost translate "architecture and the art of making brick" into "the Orders and the art of making brick" Certainly the Orders enjoyed a status second to nothing in Jefferson's scale of architectural values, and Cosby is associated with buildings where the Orders were used with sophistication.⁶¹

⁶¹Dabney Cosby's obituary appears in The North Carolina Standard (Raleigh), 12 July 1862, 3:1. The most recent attempt at a summary of Cosby's career is Sara Moline, "Dabney Cosby (1779-1862), Early Nineteenth-Century Architectural Master," research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2002.

II. Jefferson's Campaign to Reform Virginia Architecture

- A. Problems and Solutions: Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia (London, 1787)
- B. Jefferson and the Orders
- C. Jefferson and Durable Construction
- D. Jefferson and Models
- E. The Virginia Courthouse before Jefferson
- F. K214-K215: Jefferson's Drawing and Specifications for a Courthouse (n.d.)
- G. An "Eloquent Muddle": The Second Loudoun County Courthouse (ca. 1809-1811)
- H. The University of Virginia, Jefferson, the Workmen, and Latrobe
- I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

I. The Buckingham County Courthouse (1822-23)

And what of the Buckingham County Courthouse, which Kimball derived from K214-K215? BUCKINGHAM MUST BE REWRITTEN AFTER SEEING BRIAN BATES'S REPORT AND COORDINATING WITH D. HUGHES: THE POINTS ARE THAT (1. THE BODY WAS, AFTER ALL, A VERY GRAND TUSCAN TEMPLE, CONFORMING SIGNIFICANTLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF K214-K215 – THIS WAS A JEFFERSON BUILDING -- BUT THE FRONT WAS STRETCHED TO 100 FEET IN EXTENT WITH TUSCAN COLONNADES ALLA UVA AND OFFICES ALLA THE MONTICELLO PAVILIONS; (2. IF D. HUGHES LETS ME CITE HIS WORK, THE BUILDING SHOULD BE ATTRIBUTED TO PARRISH AND HOWARD FOR THE WOODWORK AND COSBY FOR THE MASONRY; AND (3. THIS BUILDING EXERTED QUITE AN INFLUENCE – PROBABLY.. This mysterious building probably fit much of the pattern discussed above. The documents tell a shadowy tale, beginning not in Buckingham but in Botetourt County. A Jefferson letter of 1818 is the earliest datable document of his activity in designing courthouses. The letter, to to James Breckinridge [sp?], one of the University of Virginia Visitors, records that Jefferson was sending a design for the Botetourt courthouse in Fincastle. There the

documentation of the episode stops, leaving no evidence as to whether Jefferson's design was used. The courthouse that was built was replaced in 1845-47, unrecorded except for an 1832 map, where a crude diagram shows a building with wings and a rounded protrusion over the center. The winged courthouse is at issue in the present study, and the pattern would resurface at a site some seventy-five miles east of Fincastle, at Buckingham.⁶²

On 12 July 1821 Charles Yancey, a , wrote Jefferson requesting a design for the Buckingham County Courthouse. Jefferson sent a design, his second documented essay in courthouse architecture, "in the plainest style," with a letter of 23 July 1821. The ex-President urged the Buckinghamites to use University of Virginia workmen, noting the existence of a three-foot basement in his design, and mentioning "4 pr of stone caps and bases for your column." The latter, Jefferson wrote, could be dressed in Buckingham by one of the University workmen if the local stone was good, or they could be cut in Charlottesville and shipped by water. This letter, buttressed by Jefferson's [habitual reliance on a small group of models for public buildings?], would tally with a Tuscan temple body. A year later, on 4 July 1822, Yancey resumed his correspondence with Jefferson. Yancey wrote that the Buckingham board of commissioners had rejected Jefferson's design and chosen the model of the Albemarle County Courthouse. Only in June, 1822, did the commissioners, learning of the dissatisfaction in Charlottesville with the Albemarle courthouse, change their minds. "Your plan," Yancey wrote, "was adopted entire," but with "a wing on each side, of 16 feet sq. attached to the main building by an entry of eight feet with an arch on each side, flat roof and columns to the wings." Yancey feared that the colonnades -- a feature strongly suggesting the impact of the University

⁶²Cite Hughes 1993 12-13 [AND PASS?]; Babbidge. Other? TJ took a long time sending drg. I think that D. Hughes argues that this shows that TJ worked a long time on the design. Isn't this arguable? He was after all sick.

of Virginia -- would not “finish well to the portico of the main building.” A week afterward, Jefferson, acquiescing to the wings, advised on how they should meet the body of the building.

The Buckingham structure arose in the years 1822-23, apparently at the hands of workmen who played leading parts in disseminating the Jefferson courthouse style. Thanks to Delos Hughes’s research, we can cautiously attribute the Buckingham masonry to Dabney Cosby and the woodwork more surely to Valentine Parrish and William A. Howard, the latter man having also made the necessary working drawings [JUST REREAD D.] No picture or description of the building survives from the years before it burned in 1869, but at the time of the fire it did have two wings. It was rebuilt as a temple of the baseless Roman Doric rising from ground level, not from a basement. It is a question how far the second building reflects the first and whether it represents the influence of Dabney Cosby’s almost-adjacent Presbyterian Church (ca. 1830?). Four [five?] almost uninterpretable bases and/or capitals remain in front of the court house. Archeological excavation in 2003 disclosed evidence of Yancey’s [eight-foot arch on the west?]. The foundations of the rear of the courtroom are inaccessible under later construction, so there is no evidence about a possible apse. All in all, it would make sense for Jefferson to have devised this courthouse a temple, for the temple form to have survived into execution between two wings, and for a reminiscence of that form to have arisen with the second, extant courthouse on the site.⁶³

⁶³[CITE DOCUMENTS IN MICROF; ALSO Kimball, 192-95. Jefferson did not actually mention the bassement; rather, he wrote of a two-foot foundation and a watertable five feet above the bottom of that foundation. These figures leave a basement of three feet and match the K215 figures for foundation and basement. For the final form of the courthouse, see the account of the fire in the Richmond Dispatch, 2 March 1869, mentioning “the two wings of the building” (a text also availabe in transcription in James Randolph Kidd, Jr., “The Buckingham County Courthouse Fire,” Magazine of Virginia Genealogy 36 (Spring 19 YEAR?):89-93. (I thank Phillip Adams for these references.) ALSO CITE WHATEVER GET FROM ARCHEOLOGIST

[A BIG QUESTION ABOUT BUCKINGHAM: DID IT, UNDER KNOWN UVA INFL., MAY HAVE HAD GROUND-LEVEL PORTICO FIRST?]

In the definitive form of the Jeffersonian courthouse, however, the portico would stand almost at ground level. That definitive placement perhaps represented deliberate continuity with eighteenth-century ground-level courthouse arcades, and it assuredly embodied the impact of the temple-form pavilions at ground level that sprang up at the University of Virginia when Latrobe's thinking fused there with Jefferson's. As we shall see, the accessibility of such porches is a matter of interest apropos of function.⁶⁴

⁶⁴Particularly puzzling is Jefferson's notation "within the portico a socle 8. I[inches]. to make the floor of the portico 8.I. lower than that of the courtroom."

From a different and tantalizing line of descent came the second Henrico County Courthouse in Richmond. Samuel Sublett designed this edifice, which William C. Allen and William Sheets built in 1825. The courthouse, moved in 1843, burned in 1865, rebuilt in 1867, and razed ca. 1895 for a new building, is an elusive subject despite diligent research. The building took the form of a tetrastyle temple of 70 x 46 feet. Uniquely among the known Virginia Jeffersonian courthouses, the Henrico building, according to its original insurance policy, had two doors inside the portico flanking a central window (fig. 52?), a treatment suggesting a relation to Virginia churches with twin entries. The insurance policy also illustrates distinctly Neoclassical segmentally curved fanlights.⁶⁵

⁶⁵On the problems of the Henrico Courthouse, see John W. Dameron, "Samuel Sublett and Richmond's Henrico County Courthouse of 1825," research report, ARTH 789 (Brownell), Virginia Commonwealth University, 2003.

CHAPTER III
 THE CHARLOTTE COUNTY COURTHOUSE
 Charlotte Court House, 1822-23
 Alterations 1852-54, 1859-60

A. CONCISE DOCUMENTED CHRONOLOGY

- 1821 July 23 Responding to a request from Charles Yancey for a design for the Buckingham County Courthouse, Jefferson replied with a letter and “the drawings you desired.”⁶⁶
- 1821 September 3 The commissioners [for new Charlotte County courthouse] contracted with John Percival, to replace their dilapidated frame courthouse with a new brick building.⁶⁷
- 1821 December 28 Jefferson’s friend William H. Cabell of Buckingham County wrote Jefferson. Cabell’s son-law, Henry Carrington, one of the commissioners for the new courthouse, would visit Jefferson for help in drawing contracts to build the courthouse on the plan that Jefferson had provided for the Buckingham County Courthouse.⁶⁸
- 1823 August 4 The Charlotte County commissioners accepted the building from Percival at a cost of \$5,362.61 exclusive of stone for the portico.⁶⁹

⁶⁶Thomas Jefferson Papers, Library of Congress, [ADD MICROFICHE CITATION.]

⁶⁷Charlotte County Order Book 23, [p.? l.?] 16. The volume is available at the Library of Virginia [ADD MICROF.]

⁶⁸Thomas Jefferson Papers, Coolidge Collection, Massachusetts Historical Society [ADD MICROF.]

⁶⁹Charlotte County Order Book 24, [p.? l.?] 52 [ADD MICROF.]

A. CONCISE DOCUMENTED CHRONOLOGY (Cont.)

1852-1854 The County repaired and altered the courthouse.⁷⁰

1959-60 The County renovated the courthouse.⁷¹

B. CONCISE HISTORY

The data in the story of the Charlotte County Court House are well known. In 1821 the county determined to replace a [disintegrating?] frame courthouse and contracted for a brick courthouse with an established but now-obscure carpenter, John Percival of Lynchburg. In a variant on the custom of modeling new buildings on standing construction, Jefferson's friend William H. Cabell advised Jefferson in 1821 that Cabell's son-in-law wanted Jefferson's aid in "[QUOTATION]." In 1823, not four months after the County accepted the building from Percival, the [commissioners?] for a new Lunenburg County Courthouse, carrying the cycle of imitation into its next turn, advertised that their new courthouse was to be built "after the plan of the new courthouse in Charlotte County." Little more than a decade after construction, Joseph Martin's gazetteer of Virginia (1835) asserted that the court house had been "built on a plan furnished by Mr. Jefferson." P In 1852-54, the County subjected the building to a major alteration.⁷²

⁷⁰Charlotte County Order Book 34, 2, 2 August 1852; 123, 4 August 1853; 186-87, 5 June 1854.

⁷¹Hughes, 17. [NEED ANYTHING FURTHER?]

⁷²The basic sources for the courthouse are [DHR file; Peter and Peters; Delos Hughes, "The Charlotte County Courthouse: Attribution and Misattribution in Jefferson Studies," *Arris* 4 (1993):8-18 [1 more reading for DHR project is advisable. Shouldn't have to concentrate on anything except transcription of specs.]; William H., Gaines, Jr. "Courthouses of Bedford and Charlotte Counties," *Virginia Cavalcade* 21 (Summer 1971):4-13 [worth rereading before finish report and lecture, but this is county hx w. almost no arch'l content.] For Martin's comment, see his *New and Comprehensive Gazetteer [sic] of Virginia, and the District of Columbia* (Charlottesville: , 1835), 150. P NO IS OK. For the Lunenburg advertisement, see the *Richmond Enquirer*, 25 November 1823.

C. THE PLAN

As Delos Hughes demonstrated, the plan of Charlotte County's Tuscan temple of justice (figs. 000-000) embodies Jefferson's reform of the Virginia courthouse. The Charlotte County plan in fact is the realization of Jefferson's K214-K215 conception (fig. 000), with the exception of its relation to ground level. The K214-K215 design follows the principle that Jefferson mastered in maturing his design for the Virginia State Capitol, that is, the principle of inserting a room arrangement sanctioned by Virginia custom into the noblest kind of container, a temple.

Externally the building appears to be an oblong temple handled, alla Palladio, with great chastity. The visitor steps onto a four-column portico that, in a major departure from Classical temples as well as from the Richmond Capitol, stands very accessibly almost at ground level, like the arcaded Virginia courthouses of the eighteenth century and like most [?] of the temple-form pavilions at the University of Virginia. Court day use? This piazza-portico was an outdoor room, a gathering place. Long used for posting bills, its brick wall is pocked with a [band?] of holes, some [?] with the nails that held the notices still in place.

Inside the windowed front wall the dominant model shifts from ancient shrines to Colonial public buildings. Immediately within the entry rises a gallery that holds ? jury rooms and is reached by twin staircases. At the opposite end of the room are the bar and the bench. As Hughes showed (fig. 000), this latter area originally matched Jefferson's K214 plan in having an apse in the eighteenth century manner. In the distinctively Jeffersonian fashion of K214, however, the Charlotte County apse as built took the form of three sides of an octagon fitted inside the oblong, rectangular, temple-shaped body, or, rather, an arcaded continuation of that body. The arrangement, as Jefferson wrote on the K215 specifications (fig. 000) was no doubt

for “[light and air],” but with the arcade to break the full force of the sun. This polygon-in-a-box feature disappeared when the courthouse was altered in 1852-54.

D. THE CONSTRUCTION

The construction of the Charlotte County Courthouse well represents Jefferson’s standards of durable construction. The body of the building is of red brick, blah blah blah. Penciling is visible, especially up the wall. The struck joints stop at the corner.⁷³

The columns are, in the language of K215, “of brick plaistered / caps and bases stone.” P Here, unmistakably, is what Jefferson had discussed with Latrobe in 1804: “most of the buildings erected under Palladio’s direction . . . have their columns made of brick . . . and covered over with stucco.” Nowhere is the Charlotte County Courthouse more deeply Palladian than in the acceptance of stuccoed brick, the combination of materials upon which Palladio himself depended for much of his executed work. At the same time, whatever the original color of the Charlotte columns, it is evident that they contrasted markedly with the unconcealed red brick of the walls in a fashion that did not come from Palladio. Rather, this contrast probably had entered Virginia building practice around 1700 with the creation of the public buildings of Williamsburg. When Jefferson — sometime after designing the Virginia Capitol — abandoned the idea of an all-over stuccoed surface for public buildings and accepted the contrast between red brick and pale ornamentation, he accepted one of the most recognizable of architectural “Americanisms,” thereby taking a dramatic step away from Palladio and .⁷⁴

In contrast, the exterior entablature, the pediment, and the internal Tuscan Order have been Americanized in their materials and are of wood. This was OK with Vitruvius. It may

⁷³I am grateful to Calder Loth, TITLE, for sharing his observations on the brickwork with me during a visit to Charlotte Court House on 20 March 1993.

be significant that wooden entablatures and pediments for Tuscan temples were authorized by Vitruvius.

A. THE ORNAMENTS

In the language of Jefferson's world, the principal "ornaments" of architecture were the Orders. In the ornaments of the Charlotte County Courthouse, all the major currents of Classicism operating in the United States in the early nineteenth century flowed together. We can see this by starting at the bottom of the Order and moving up.

The Charlotte Tuscan Order rises from just above ground level, perhaps in an echo of eighteenth-century arcaded courthouses and certainly in a reverberation of the Latrobe-Jefferson temple porticoes along the Lawn at the University of Virginia. Like the stucco-over-brick construction, the chastity of effect is Palladian, as are the general lines of the Order. Important details, though, stem not from Palladio but from major disciples of his. Thus the column bases have two convex moldings, either from clumsy execution or in imitation of Inigo Jones's Tuscan base at St. Paul's, Covent Garden (fig. 000). Less debatably, the entablature generally [?] follows the Palladian profile established for the Palladian Tuscan by Fréart de Chambray (fig. 000), but with the flat soffit instituted by James Gibbs (fig. 000).

The portico proportions, however, are by no means Palladian. In particular, the columns measure 2' 4" across through the base and 18' high, and they thus rise to almost 8 diameters (actually 7.71), not the 7 diameters of Vitruvius and Palladio or the 7.03 diameters of Jefferson's K215. (These unorthodox, Adamesque proportions have passed undetected partly because photographers have favored diagonal views of the portico that conceal the lightness of this porch.)

⁷⁴For Jefferson to Latrobe, 28 February 1804, see above and Latrobe, Correspondence, 1:439-40.

As to the entablature area, in a truly [?] Jeffersonian touch, the bell is not integrated into the Order, merely dangling from the central intercolumniation like a set of testicles.⁷⁵ Above this, the lunette window, a familiar feature of Jeffersonian porticoes, found its way here by a very impure route, beginning not in temple pediments but perhaps under the vaulting of Roman baths and wending from the work of Sir Christopher Wren into eighteenth-century Anglo-American building practice [CHECK FOSTER].⁷⁶

B. CONCLUSION

One could scarcely ask for a more complete embodiment of the fortunes of Jefferson's campaign of reform than the Charlotte County Courthouse. In its origin the courthouse reflected the custom of modeling new buildings on approved conceptions, and the building was barely completed before it begat a derivative at Lunenburg [or chain of derivatives?] via the same custom.

⁷⁵Delete this figure of speech.

⁷⁶Jones's Tuscan base, with an astragal on a torus (a treatment akin to Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola's Doric base) was published not later than Batty Langley's Ancient Masonry (London, 173), pls. , and reached American practice not later than James Wren's Christ Church, Alexandria (17 -), where it appears in the Palladian window. For the dimensions of the courthouse as built compared with K215, see Hughes, "Charlotte County Courthouse," 15. VITRU ON WOOD PED For a convincing account of the route by which the unclassical pedimental lunette reached Jefferson, see Heather A. Foster, "Jefferson, Wren, Philadelphia, and the Portico with Lunette," In The Classical Tradition: From Andrea Palladio to John Russell Pope: New Findings from Virginia Commonwealth University, Abstracts of the Sixth Annual Architectural History Symposium, 1998, ed. by Charles Brownell, 10-11 (Richmond: Department of Art History, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1998). It is a question whether Jefferson approved of windows in the pediments of non-domestic buildings.

CHAPTER IV
 LUNEBURG COUNTY COURTHOUSE
 Lunenberg, finished 1827;
 Alterations

TIME'S UP. FILL THIS IN BY ADAPTING INFORMATION FROM NHL NOMINATION.

WHICH FIRST—LUNENBURG OR GOOCHLAND?

A. CONCISE DOCUMENTED CHRONOLOGY

[INSERT CHRONOLOGY FROM CRAIG REYNOLDS.]

B. CONCISE HISTORY

[DITTO.]

See Jefferson's program working: was planned in imitation of Charlotte.

The research of Craig Reynolds had begun to draw William A. Howard (ca. 1787-
 ca. 1854/1860), one of the best of the courthouse builders, from almost complete obscurity.

C. THE PLAN

[Portico, with its unlocked, glass-enclosed bulletin-boards [?], continues to serve
 as a place where the public can post bills freely. In a touch that is possibly unique, the bell is
 used via a string [?] that dangles through portico ceiling. Courtroom was moved upstairs.
 Reynolds is effective on courtroom heat and use of those stairs. Apse survives but has been
 buried in a symphthetic addition.]

D. THE CONSTRUCTION

[Brickwork. Reynolds can account for the source of the stone for the Order.]

E. THE ORNAMENTS

At Lunenburg, Jefferson's campaign to set models for the Orders scored a major success. Whereas most [?] of the Virginia's other Jeffersonian courthouses employ the Tuscan, the Lunenburg courthouse is a temple in a slightly simplified interpretation of the Doric of Palladio, an Order dear to Jefferson. Jefferson had tried and failed to give specimens of this Doric in the Hall of the House of Delegates at the Virginia State Capitol and the Hall of Representatives at the U. S. Capitol. He set a model of ditto at Monti as the exterior Ord; he set a model of ditto on the Lawn as his 1st Pav.; and Howard and/or co. commissioners responded to that campaign by using the Doric of Palladio at Lunenburg, on a grander sequel to Charlotte Ct Hs.

F. CONCLUSION

CHAPTER IV
 GOOCHLAND COUNTY COURTHOUSE
 Goochland Court House, 1826-27;
 Alterations

A. DOCUMENTED CHRONOLOGY

[INSERT CHRONOLOGY FROM SARA MOLINE, IF ANYTHING THERE. BUT
 MAINLY USE AGEE 44-50 TO GET TO ORDER BOOKS.]

B. CONCISE HISTORY

[Account of construction, incorporating bio of Cosby, the most successful [?] of the Jefferson courthouse builders. Despite Sara Moline's research, Cosby's early years as a successful builder in Staunton remain a blank. Cosby acquired the distinction of working with three of the most important of all American architects. He worked with the great Palladian amateur, Jefferson, at the University of Virginia, where, if we can trust Cosby's obituary, Jefferson trained Cosby in both architecture and bricklaying. Cosby in his mature years worked with two major American Romantics and founders of the profession, Thomas U. Walter and Alexander J. Davis.]

C. THE PLAN

D. THE CONSTRUCTION

E. THE ORNAMENTS

[Once again, skinny Tuscan strikes.]

F. CONCLUSION

VI. Conclusion

[This is the only place that I have to say e.g. the town hall plan competed with Jefferson's temple-form courthouse.] It would appear that, at Buckingham, the temple triumphed over the town hall and that the temple-shaped core building by Jefferson at Buckingham had a direct and long-lasting impact. [CHECK] Charlotte C H was the child of Buckingham and the parent of Lunenburg, which later begat Mecklenburg. In a different family line, Buckingham was one of the parents of Goochland which in turn was a progenitor of Fluvanna, which, in a "Greek Revival" generation, had issue at Powhatan County Courthouse. Jefferson's Temples of Justice did not have the field to themselves, however. [FILL IN ABOUT JEFFERSONIZED TOWN HALL TYPE, THEN CENTER AND WING TYPE, E.G. NOTTOWAY].⁷⁷

⁷⁷I interpret the contest of temple and town hall types at Buckingham à la Hughes, Courthouses," 7, 10, 18.

Appendix 1 Thomas Jefferson's Specifications for a Model Courthouse

The following is a transcription of 215 in the Massachusetts Historical Society Blah Blah. [NOT CHECKED AGAINST HUGHES HANDLING.]

f I f

The interior of the house (exlcusive of Portico) is 59 -6 by 44

The exterior[60.9 emended to 61.0?] by 42-.6

the order Tuscan -	foundation	f i 2-0	
	Basement	3-0	but within the Portico a socle 8. i. [added] to make the floor of the Portico 8 i.lower than that of the court room
	Column	17-7	
	Entablature	4-5	
	Pediment	49-9-1/2 span	
		11-6 height	
	Diameter	2-6	
	Diminished do.	1-10-1/2	
	1' [minute]	= 1/2 i.	
	projection of cornice	11 i.	

The arches at the outward corners. 10. f wide
height of the arch from the watertable 12 f
height of the impost.....7.f

the doors 4. f wide 8 f. high.
lower windows 3f.3i. 6 f. 6 i. upper 3 f 3 i. by 4 f 9 in.

the windows in the end [I CAN'T TRANSCRIBE REST OF SECTION ALONE]

The inner columns. Tuscan. order entire	f i 12-0
entablature	2-5
column	9-7
diam.	16.4
dimd. do.	12.3

the [outer?] of brick, plastered
caps and bases stone.

the two arches at each of the back corners are to give light & air thro'
the windows of the court bench.

the windows embrac'g the judge's chair give light & air there.
[I CAN'T TRANSCRIBE REST OF SECTION ALONE]

Appendix 1 Thomas Jefferson's Specifications for a Model Courthouse (cont.)

the court room is 21. f pitch in the clear. at the end neat [sic] the

Portico this is divided into 2. half stories the lower half story
 of 12 f pitch makes a part of the area of the court room enlarging it by 15 f The upper [illeg.] half
 of 8 f. pitch in the clear gives 3 jury rooms of about 14 f. square, opening
 out of the gallery, & with a single window each
 the weaker lines on the paper are 1. f. each, the stronger 1010. f.

Select Bibliography

- Adams, Evelyn Taylor. *The Courthouse in Virginia Counties, 1634-1776*. With a foreword by Frederick D. Nichols, A. I. A. Warrenton, Virginia: printed in the shop of the *Fauquier Democrat*, 1966.
- Bucklen, Mary Kegley, and Larrie L. Bucklen. *County Courthouses of Virginia, Old and New*. Charleston, West Virginia: Pictorial Histories Publishing Company, 1988.
- County Court Houses of the United States: The Seagram County Court House Archives and Other Photographic Collections in the Library of Congress*. Microform. Essex, New York: Dunlap Society, 1981.
- Gwathmey, John H. *Legends of Virginia Courthouses*. With pencil illustrations by Lucy Payne Pinder. Richmond: Press of the Dietz Printing Company, 1933.
- Peet, George, and Gabrielle Keller, photographers. *Courthouses of the Commonwealth*. Edited with a preface by Robert J. Brink. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984.
- Pevsner, Nikolaus. A History of Building Types. The A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, the National Gallery of Art, 1970; Bollingen Series XXXV, 19. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Thrane, Susan W. *County Courthouses of Ohio*. Photographs by Tom Patterson and Bill Patterson. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.

THE FOLLOWING PP MAY STILL BE OF USE .

Colonel Isaac A. Coles reported of Jefferson that "Palladio he said 'was the Bible'"; see Coles to General John Hartwell Cocke, 23 February 1816, University of Virginia Library, Special Collections Department, Cocke Papers, No. 640 etc. [YES, EDITOR, THAT IS HOW UVA WANTS THIS CITED--"etc."], Box 21. This is a second-hand quotation, but the evidence of Jefferson's buildings and documents tallies emphatically with it.

On Jefferson's architectural books, see William Bainter O'Neal, *Jefferson's Fine Arts Library: His Selections for the University of Virginia, together with His Own Architectural Books* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1976), under the author's name. For Jefferson's dependence on Leoni's three -- often corrupt -- editions of Palladio's *Quattro Libri* (1570), see *The Making of Virginia Architecture*, p. 47; for Jefferson's estimation of the Orders, p. 49 and esp. p. 79, n. 38.

ALL QUOTATIONS ARE PROOFED. TRIM LIKE HELL?

Jefferson's architectural career before and after the Notes amply testifies to the durability of the ideas that he voiced in his book. In the case of the Orders, he treated his larger buildings – those that could hold more than one specimen -- as museums of the Orders from one end of his designing activity to the other, that is, from Monticello I () through the University of Virginia (). In other instances, he contented himself with setting a model for a single Order, as in the instance of his courthouse design.

At rare moments after the Notes Jefferson wrote revealing statements of his principles. A vivid case concerns the Orders. In 1804-1805 Jefferson promoted the Richmond career of a former housejoiner of his, James Oldham (1770s-1843). Jefferson recommended Oldham to a prominent Richmonder on three grounds: Oldham was able at his craft, personally dependable, and “skilled in the orders of architecture.” Oldham soon received the commission to [enlarge?] an important Richmond villa called Moldavia (remodeled 180 -). To enable Oldham to set a model of the Corinthian Order in the Moldavia parlor, Jefferson took surprising pains, given his presidential duties, but Jefferson wrote Oldham (19 January 1805) that “a single example of chaste architecture may guide the taste of the city.” To shape the taste of Richmond, Jefferson went to considerable lengths to equip Oldham with a copy of Palladio [REVIEW MOLDAVIA CHRON. DOES THIS COVER TJ' S EFFORT PROPERLY?] Lending an incomplete edition of Palladio, Jefferson wrote Oldham (24 December 1804) that the loan copy “contains only the 1st. book on the orders, which is the essential part.”⁷⁸ Jefferson took the trouble to have the composition ornaments for the

⁷⁸For Jefferson's handling of buildings as “museums of the Orders,” see Charles Brownell, “Thomas Jefferson's Architectural Models and the United States Capitol,” in *A Republic for the Ages: The United States Capitol and the Political Culture of the Early Republic*, edited by Donald R. Kennon (Charlottesville: published for the United States Capitol Historical Society by the University Press of

Corinthian frieze cast in molds that he had had cut for Monticello and even chose the pattern himself. The destruction of Moldavia (ca. 1890) and much of early Richmond makes it hard to test whether Jefferson did create a successful precedent for the use of Palladian Orders in the young city.⁷⁹ It is suggestive that Moldavia had a two-tiered Palladian portico like those that Jefferson devised for Monticello I, but with a wildly unorthodox handling of the Orders, including a Tuscan Order stretched in the Adamesque manner much beyond Palladian proportions.⁸⁰

Virginia, 1999) PAGES. Jefferson wrote John Harvie of Richmond his opinion of Oldham's skill with the Orders on 27 September 1804 (Coolidge Collection, Massachusetts Historical Society [reel 4]). On Moldavia see Jurgens, Brownell and Jurgens in LVA 41, maybe Bodman, also Brownell "Models". Jefferson's letter to Oldham survives in two copies, at the University of Virginia Library (reel 5) and the Library of Congress (reel 31).

⁷⁹The Oldham-Jefferson documents are scattered. One can most conveniently consult them in the Jefferson Papers at the Library of Congress, which has copies of much of the Oldham-Jefferson correspondence on Moldavia from 11 January to 2 May 1805 (reel 32). Oldham to Jefferson, 30 June 1805, is in the Coolidge Collection, Massachusetts Historical Society (reel 4). I do not know what understanding Jefferson and Andrews had about the molds.

⁸⁰For Jefferson's handling of buildings as "museums of the Orders," see Charles Brownell, "Thomas Jefferson's Architectural Models and the United States Capitol," in *A Republic for the Ages: The United States Capitol and the Political Culture of the Early Republic*, edited by Donald R. Kennon (Charlottesville: published for the United States Capitol Historical Society by the University Press of Virginia, 1999) PAGES. Jefferson wrote John Harvie of Richmond his opinion of Oldham's skill with the Orders on 27 September 1804 (Coolidge Collection, Massachusetts Historical Society [reel 4]). WHAT DOES BODMAN SAY RE MOLDAVIA PORCH?

Jefferson's letter to Oldham survives in two copies, at the University of Virginia Library (reel 5) and the Library of Congress (reel 31).

- C. Mem: May want to counter Upton in “New Views” Sec. 12 that TJ had no major VA or US infl.